
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

The Cambridge University Press.

NOW READY. SECOND EDITION. PRICE 5s. net.

A Historical Companion to Hymns Ancient and Modern. Giving the original ancient hymns from the Greek Church and old English Church Prayer-Books, the modern foreign hymns, and the Names of all Authors and Translators, with Notes and Dates. Edited by the Rev. R. M. MOORSOM, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge; formerly Rector of Sadberge, County Durham. Second Edition. Small fcap. 8vo., 5s. net.

NOW READY. PRICE 5s. net.

Renderings of Church Hymns. From the Prayer-Books of the Greek, Armenian, Syrian, East Syrian, and Coptic Churches, and from the Early Irish, the British, the Anglo-Saxon, and Early English Churches. By the Rev. R. M. MOORSOM. MUSIC by the Rev. G. W. GRIFFITH and Mr. W. S. DE WINTON.

A Concise Bible Dictionary. Based on the Cambridge Companion to the Bible. Crown 8vo., with 8 Maps and Index, 1s. net; post free, 1s. 3d.

Extract from Preface.—"The object of the present volume is to provide Sunday School Teachers and other Students with a concise book of reference to the Bible. It is based upon the principal materials, which in the Companion are presented as a number of articles written by different scholars, but are here rearranged in the form of a brief dictionary."

Church Sunday School Magazine.—"A remarkably cheap handbook for students and teachers."

Expository Times.—"It will take the place of all other cheap dictionaries."

Journal of Education.—"Under this modest title we have an invaluable aid to Bible study, both for teachers and taught."

English Churchman.—"[This valuable] Bible help should become a favourite reference book among students of the sacred writings, especially Bible Class and Sunday School Teachers."

The Cambridge Companion to the Bible. A new collection of popular Articles on the History and Archæology of the Bible, together with full Indexes, a Glossary of Bible words, a Concordance, and a new series of Maps. Edited by the Rev. Professor J. RAWSON LUMBY, D.D., late Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity. Prices from 1s. net.

The Prayer-Book Explained. By the Rev. PERCIVAL JACKSON, M.A., Jesus College, Cambridge.

Part I. **The Daily Offices and the Litany.** 2s. 6d. *[Now ready.*
Part II. **The Holy Communion and the Occasional Offices.** *[In Preparation.*

The Church Catechism Explained. By the Rev. A. W. ROBINSON, B.D., Warden of the Mission College of All Hallows, Barking, E.C. and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Wakefield. Fifth Impression.

ST. MATTHEW IN THE REVISED VERSION FOR SCHOOLS.

The Gospel according to St. Matthew. Revised Version. Edited, with Notes, for the use of Schools, by the REV. A. CARR, M.A., Vicar of Addington, Surrey, formerly Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. With three maps, 1s. 6d. net.

School World.—"The most approved results of recent biblical criticism are embodied in the splendid notes; but, independent of its intrinsic value, there are three artistic maps incorporated in the text. An edition as remarkable for its elegance as for its high utility."

The Parallel History of the Jewish Monarchy. Printed in the Text of the Revised Version, 1885. Arranged by R. SOMERVELL, M.A., Assistant-Master and Bursar of Harrow School. With an Introduction by S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

Part I. **The Reigns of David and Solomon.** 1 Samuel xxxi. to 1 Kings xi.; 1 Chronicles x. to 2 Chronicles ix. Demy 8vo., 2s.

Part II. **The Divided Monarchy.** 1 Kings xii. to 2 Kings xxv.; 2 Chronicles x. to xxxvi. Second Edition. Demy 8vo., 2s.

Six or more copies of the two following books for class use can be supplied at half the published prices, and may be ordered through any Bookseller.

Gospel History of Our Lord Jesus Christ in the Language of the Revised Version, arranged in a Connected Narrative, especially for the use of Teachers and Preachers. By Rev. C. C. JAMES, M.A., Rector of Wortham, Suffolk, and late Fellow of King's College. Crown 8vo. Second Edition. 3s. 6d.

A Harmony of the Gospels in the words of the Revised Version, with copious References, Tables, etc. Arranged by Rev. C. C. JAMES, M.A. Crown 8vo. Second Edition. 5s.

LONDON: C. J. CLAY & SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE, AVE MARIA LANE.

ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW BOOKS.

In demy 8vo., handsomely printed in large type, and bound in cloth, price 7s. 6d. net.

KEY TO THE HEBREW PSALTER. By the Rev. GEORGE AUGUSTUS ALCOCK, Ethical Moderator and Graduate in Honours of Trinity College, Dublin.

A Lexicon and Concordance combined, wherein are all the Words and Particles which occur in the Book of Psalms, the verses in which to find them, together with their chief Inflections, Roots, etc.

"The amount of care and research which Mr. Alcock must have devoted to his task is little less than marvellous."—*Irish Times.*

"The work deserves the highest commendation."—*English Churchman.*

In foolscap 8vo., paper boards, price 3s. 6d.

ST. PAUL. Addresses delivered in London. By the Rev. ROWLAND W. CORBET, late Rector of Stoke-on-Tern, Author of "Letters from a Mystic of the Present Day."

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 3s. 6d.

SERMONS OF THE AGE. Thirteen Sermons. By the Rev. T. MEREDITH WILLIAMS, B.A., Vicar of Llanarth, Cardiganshire.

In demy 8vo., paper cover, price 1s. net.

THE LORD'S SUPPER: What it is, and what it is not. By WERNER H. K. SOAMES, M.A., Cantab., Vicar of St. George's, Greenwich.

In crown 8vo., gilt lettered, price 1s. 6d. net.

THE WORK OF THE MINISTRY. Five Ordination Addresses. By the Rev. R. G. HUNT, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Wolverhampton.

"A wise and timely contribution to the subject of pastoral training. Admirable in tone and spirit, thoroughly sane, and profoundly evangelical. The truth is put with great clearness and directness."—*Weekly Leader.*

In demy 8vo., tastefully printed on thick paper, price 1s. net.

EVIL, NOT EVERLASTING. A Paper read in outline before the Rugeley Branch of the Society of Sacred Study. By Rev. OSMOND DOBREE, M.A., of the University of Dublin, Prebendary of Lichfield, Vicar of Colwich.

NEW BOOKS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE.

In crown 8vo., tastefully printed and bound in cloth, with two illustrations, price 1s. 6d.

MOSES AND THE WILDERNESS. Joshua and Canaan. For boys and girls. By Mrs. E. R. CONDER.

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered and Illustrated, price 5s.

THE CROSS OF PEARLS: or, the Story of a French Family in the Fourteenth Century. By MRS. BEARNE.

"A pretty little romance of fourteenth-century France, full of the bustle of warfare, and with charming pictures of chivalry and medieval life clustered around the fortunes of a pair of noble lovers."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

ORPHAN WORKING SCHOOL,

FOUNDED 1758.

500 FATHERLESS CHILDREN ARE MAINTAINED AND EDUCATED.

Senior School—**MAITLAND PARK, N.W.**
Junior School—**HORNSEY RISE, N.**
Convalescent Home—**HAROLD ROAD, MARGATE.**

Patrons: His Majesty THE KING, Her Majesty QUEEN ALEXANDRA.
President: Field-Marshal H.R.H. the DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE, K.G.
Treasurer—Sir HORACE BROOKS MARSHALL, M.A., LL.D., J.P.

NEW ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS & DONATIONS ARE URGENTLY NEEDED

So that the work of the charity may be fully maintained.

Two Votes are allowed at each Election for every Guinea subscribed.

SECRETARY: **ALEXANDER GRANT.** OFFICES: 73, CHEAPSIDE, E.C.
BANKERS: LONDON JOINT STOCK, PRINCES STREET, E.C.

EDUCATIONAL.

WEYMOUTH COLLEGE.

A fully equipped Public School

in which Boys are definitely prepared for the Universities, any of the Professions, or for Business Life. Very healthy situation by the sea. Splendid Fields for Cricket and Football. Reduction made for the Sons of Clergy and Officers. The moral and spiritual welfare of the Boys is cared for, as well as the intellectual.

Apply to H. C. BARNES-LAWRENCE, M.A., The College, WEYMOUTH, Dorsetshire.

WORCESTER CATHEDRAL KING'S SCHOOL.

Head Master: Rev. W. H. CHAPPEL, M.A.,

Formerly Scholar of Worcester College, Oxford, and lately Assistant and House Master at Marlborough College

First-Grade Endowed School. Public School Education at moderate cost. Twenty King's Scholars receive Tuition Free. Election annually in November. Valuable Exhibitions at the Universities. Spacious modern Boarding House. Healthy Site. Special Terms to sons of Clergy.

For Prospectus and Honour List apply, THE HEAD MASTER, SCHOOL HOUSE, WORCESTER.

DAVENTRY GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

Founded A.D. 1600.

PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION at moderate cost. Resident staff of University Graduates in Honours. Entrance scholarships. Special terms for sons of clergy and medical men. Sound Church teaching, Healthy situation, 800 feet above sea-level. Good buildings. Large Playing-fields, Laboratory, Gymnasium. Fives' Court. Experienced Matron.

Entrance Scholarship for Sons of Clergy naturally reducing Fees.

For Prospectus apply: REV. H. JOHNSON, *Head Master.*

ECCLESIASTICAL INSURANCE OFFICE, LTD.

11, NORFOLK STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

FIRE INSURANCE. BURGLARY INSURANCE. GLASS INSURANCE.

The Surplus Profits are devoted to Institutions, etc., which are for the benefit of the Clergy and of Church objects.

For Information and Forms, apply at the Joint Offices of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, Ltd., and the Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

JOHN DUNCAN, F.I.A., *Secretary.*

"This is a serious attempt made in good faith to help the Clergy to help themselves, and to husband the existing resources of the Church."—*Guardian.*

CLERGY PENSIONS INSTITUTION.

11, NORFOLK STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

The distinguishing characteristic of the scheme of the Institution may be concisely stated in the three words, "Self-help aided." Clergymen who wish to secure the benefits of the Institution for themselves or their families exercise self-help by making payments in purchase of Benefits; while Honorary Contributions are applied to augment the Benefits so purchased. The Institution comprises the following:

1. Clergy Pensions Fund; 2. Sickness Fund; 3. Widows and Orphans Fund; 4. Daughters Fund; 5. Other Benefits Fund; 6. Personal Accident Assurance (Clergy); 7. Accidents to Employees (Assurance of Liability of Clergy as Employers).

For Information and Forms, apply at the Joint Offices of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, Ltd., and the Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

JOHN DUNCAN, F.I.A., *Secretary and Actuary.*

THE SOCIETY FOR RELIEF OF PERSECUTED JEWS

(SYRIAN COLONIZATION FUND)

Employs 70 Jews at Abraham's Vineyard, Jerusalem, in cultivation of ground, quarrying and dressing stone, building, and olive oil soap making, and distributes drinking water to many hundreds of poor Jews who have no supply from—rock-hewn cisterns, constructed by Jews on the vineyard. Also gives clothing and food to 1,500 mothers, mostly sick, feeble, or blind, with families.

FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED that more of the starving Jews may be employed.

CONTRIBUTIONS THANKFULLY RECEIVED by—

F. A. BEVAN, *Hon. Treasurer*, 54, LOMBARD STREET, E.C.

Messrs. DRUMMOND, *Bankers*, 49, CHARING CROSS, S.W.

AND BY

E. A. FINN, *Secretary*, 41, PARLIAMENT STREET, S.W.,

where the Olive Oil Soap may be had for 4/- per doz. tablets, post free.

"LIBERATOR" RELIEF FUND.

Patron: H.R.H. PRINCE CHRISTIAN.

£10,000 required to Relieve New and Urgent Cases.

HUNDREDS of aged and afflicted victims, so cruelly robbed of their life-savings by the great Liberator Fraud, just as they were hoping to enjoy the fruit of their industry and thrift. Many of them are members of the Church of England. Cheques and P.O.'s should be sent to the Secretary, Rev. J. STOCKWELL WATTS, 16, Farringdon Street, E.C.

THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN.

Patron: HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

Vice-Patrons:
H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES, K.G.
THE FOUR ARCHBISHOPS, THE BISHOPS, etc.

Labours afloat and ashore, at home and abroad, among seamen of all classes and nations, fishermen, bargemen, and emigrants. Seventy-three harbours are occupied. Expenditure in 1901, £40,770.

Increased Contributions and Offertories, urgently needed, should be forwarded to the Secretary, Commander W. DAWSON, R.N., 11, Buckingham St., Strand London, W.C.

AN EARNEST APPEAL.

HAMPTON'S MISSION FOR THE BLIND

Westminster Bridge Road, London, S.E.

Patron: The Right Hon. LORD LLANGATTOCK.

BANKERS: LONDON AND SOUTH WESTERN BANK, LIMITED, SOUTHWARK, S.E.

A Mission and Relief Work carried on for thirty-two years amongst the destitute ***BLIND POOR*** of London south of the Thames. Unendowed and in great need. ***The Bitter Cry for Help*** of the Destitute Blind Poor of "London over the Border."

Poverty allied with Blindness!

Is not this a double calamity?

Contributions gratefully received by

R. K. CAUSTON, ESQ., M.P., *President and Chairman.*

F. L. BEVAN, ESQ., *Hon. Treasurer at the Mission.*

THE

CHURCHMAN

JUNE, 1903.

ART. I.—BAPTISM: ITS PLACE IN THE SYSTEM, ITS PART IN THE LIFE.

II.

THE effects on personal life which Scripture ascribes to baptism are generally connected with its character of initiation. All commencements have their importance from their being commencements, and from their relation to the histories which they inaugurate. Thus the ordinance is presented in the apostolic writings, in which the *act* of baptism passes on to the *state* of the baptized. It is like entering a great building. There is but a step through the door, but that step makes the difference of being without and being within. The building in this case is the House of God, and the change is one of spiritual position. If the sacrament were a church ordinance, it would give entrance within the society; as it is an institution of Christ, it gives entrance within the covenant.

Hence great things are spoken of it, and comprehensive words are used, as if in a contributory sense it had a *saving* power. Thus our Lord saith, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"; and St. Peter affirms, "Baptism doth also now save us." Such words may require any amount of explanation, but they assert the part which baptism has in the whole result, whatever that part may be.

1. The first grace which we find associated with the ordinance is the forgiveness of sins. That was a fundamental idea in John's baptism, also in the Christian institution. It is indeed the first necessity, felt as such by man, recognised as such by God. It is the great cry of the awakened soul, "Oh that I knew if He forgiveth!" The answer was clear in the Gospel, "Through this man is proclaimed unto you the

remission of sins" (Acts xiii. 38). Of this baptism was the ordained assurance. "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins" was certainly no dubious promise. "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins" are words which St. Paul recites as addressed to himself (Acts xxii. 16). This cleansing from sin by a definite act of forgiveness was aptly represented in baptism at the beginning of Christian life and as preliminary to all further grace, and the consciousness of it is kept ever present. After a reminder of former defilements, it is added: "But ye were washed, ye were sanctified, ye were justified, etc." (1 Cor. vi. 11); and as of separate persons, so of the whole Church, it is said: "Christ loved it, and gave Himself for it, that He might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word" (Eph. vi. 26). Moreover, the sense of this sacramental cleansing remained through life, and men were ever to "draw near to God, having their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and their bodies washed with pure water" (Heb. x. 22); for the effect of that sacramental beginning of the new life continues through the course of it. The forgiveness of sins in baptism is not only a remission of sins past (in the case of an infant, what are they?) It is of the nature of an abiding grant for time to come, the grant of a right to be realized whenever, either in the hour of conversion or in habitual approach to God, the heart in repentance and faith seeks and proves the sprinkling of the precious blood. This abiding effect of baptism as the Divine pledge of forgiveness through the life of the baptized has two consequences:

(*a*) It anticipates and precludes the so-called sacrament of penance, invented to meet the case of "sins after baptism," on the supposition that it was a cleansing only for the time before it, and that its effect in after-life was to increase the sinfulness of sin, not to entail the promise of remission.

(*b*) The sacrament could never be repeated, the Divine authority being attached to the single act, in its nature one of initiation. It was the one entrance into a scheme of things marked by the note of unity. "There is one body and one Spirit, even as we are called in one hope of our calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism." Therefore in this larger and life-long sense of its purpose and effect we say, in the Nicene Creed: "I believe in one baptism for the remission of sins."

2. This grace is not detached and alone. It is a part and a consequence of a larger grace, union with Christ. That was what was sought in baptism, that was what was given. On the day when the Holy Ghost came, and Jesus was first preached as the Christ of God, the one desire and design of

those who received the Word was to join themselves to the Lord in whom they believed, and that was granted by being baptized in His name. Afterwards each, in his measure, would come to know how real, how intimate, and how practical in effect this personal and spiritual union is. St. Paul, pressing it on his converts as the essence of the Christian state, again and again connects it with their baptism in the past, setting it forth both as a general association with their Lord and as a special participation in His death, burial, and resurrection. "We who were baptized into Jesus Christ," he says to the Romans, "were baptized into His death. We were buried, therefore, with Him through baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life. For, if we have become united with Him by the likeness of His death, we shall be also by that of His resurrection" (vi. 2-11). And so he proceeds in language (accurately rendered in the R.V.), referring his readers to their baptism as the time when they "became united with Jesus Christ," so as to participate both in the power and in the likeness of "the death which He died unto sin once, and of the life which He liveth unto God." How prominent in this Apostle's teaching, and how exemplified in his own consciousness, is this living union with the Lord, which is concisely and aptly expressed by the great word, "a member of Christ"! That is not to be superficially explained as meaning only a member of His Church, the society which confesses His name. The relation is primarily not with the Church, but with Himself. It is one not inherited by birth nor to be acquired by effort, but bestowed by grant, as "a thing which by nature we cannot have," and baptism is by the Lord's institution the legal deed of conveyance of that grant, the consequences of which, however, can only be realized in fact under the power of the Word and the Spirit.

3. By virtue of union with the Son, the member of Christ is also "the child of God." That is a spiritual supernatural relationship, but can only be expressed in the terms of natural relationship, for we have no other terms to use. But as no such words are adequate to the case, different similitudes are employed to represent the truths intended, sometimes the similitude of adoption, sometimes of generation and birth. Of these one is more present to the mind of St. Paul, the other to that of St. John. The connection of baptism with the first idea is most obvious, since in the case of adoption a definite change of status was marked by a legal act, creating a relation which did not previously exist; one, too, which demanded, but did not ensure, responsive filial affections. In

like manner the sacrament of adoption needs to be followed by an inward spiritual gift, that of "the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." Then only "the Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are children of God."

This word (τέκνα) children, not frequent with St. Paul, is characteristically St. John's. The term (υἱός) son, ever appropriate to Christ, he does not use of the Christian, save once at the final consummation (Rev. xxi. 7); it is said, "He that overcometh shall inherit all things, and I will be his God, and he shall be My son." This discrimination of language is much lost in the A.V., notably in its rendering of 1 John iii. 1, 2; but it is a distinction of thought, which ought to be observed. It belongs to this Apostle's habit of representing the origination of spiritual life by the analogy of natural generation with the natural affections ensuing. The children of God are with him "begotten of God." It is an expression peculiar to him, occurring ten times in his Epistle, as it is first used in the prologue to his Gospel. The Word incarnate, he says, "came to His own, and His own received Him not; but as many as received Him, to them gave He the right to become children of God, even to them which believe on His name, which were begotten not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." This is measured, significant language. The persons receive Jesus, but they are not thereby actually children of God. The (ἐξουσία) right, title, or authority to become such is a gift from the Lord on whom they believe. It is precisely the gift of such a right which is expressed in baptism, but the right needs for its realization the breath of the Spirit of God.

4. St. John, who does not mention the institution of the two sacraments, records the words of Jesus, which by anticipation illuminate their meaning. Such is the effect of the great saying, which answered the unspoken inquiries of Nicodemus. Its application to baptism has in later days been disputed, but the situation is decisive for the plain sense of the words, as they are primarily addressed to the man and to the occasion. The public mind was deeply stirred, full of expectation and debate. What is this kingdom of God which is at hand? What means this baptism which prepares for it? Is it from heaven or of men? The Pharisees more especially were exercised in mind by the latter question. They felt called to deal with it, and had made public and official inquiry as to John's baptism and the character which he claimed for it and for himself (i. 19 to 28). But now another person has appeared, One who also baptizes through His disciples, and whose works declare Him a Teacher sent from

God. To Him comes "a man of the Pharisees, a ruler of the Jews," a serious, candid man, seeking information on the questions in his mind—in everybody's mind at that moment. The Lord's words go straight to the point, but with discoveries which transcend his thoughts. "Verily, verily I say unto thee (the first time these words are heard), Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God," and then more explicitly, "Verily, verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and spirit (ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος), he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." They are plain words, though profound, and the circumstances support the interpretation which was the only one known to antiquity, and which is given them in the opening of our Baptismal Office.

Baptism, according to this fundamental text, has a necessity and potency of its own as a factor in the new birth which qualifies for entering into the kingdom of God. That kingdom is not thought of as in a future state; it was at hand, it was coming, and it came. "When He had overcome the sharpness of death, He opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers." There is no sentence of exclusion from the kingdom, but the statement of a fact. The natural man (οὐ δύναται) is not able to see it, still less to enter into it. He has not the capacity for doing so. Does the birth of water create that capacity? It is a spiritual capacity which spirit only can generate. That is in the nature of things, as the discourse proceeds to affirm. From the bare mention of the visible sign, it passes into the sphere of the invisible, as being the region of reality, and enlarges on birth of the Spirit, which now appears as a living, life-giving, spontaneous Power. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born anew. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh and whither it goeth: so is everyone that is born of the Spirit." The lessons of these profound, comprehensive words are beyond the present purpose, which is only to consider what part belongs to the water (*i.e.*, to the sacrament), as associated with the Spirit, in the regeneration of men. That it has a representative and symbolic part is plain, and that is itself an important aspect, since the symbolism is not of human invention, but of Divine institution; but the language of Scripture elsewhere, and notably in this word of Jesus, assigns to it, not a symbolical, but a real contribution to the result. We may venture to say that the Spirit does that which the water cannot do, but the water does that which the Spirit does not do. Action on the inner man, the mind and heart, is the work of the Spirit. That is no proper effect of an appointed act, an outward and

visible sign; but for investiture with rights, privileges, and powers, this is the proper means—as in all the kingdoms of the world, so also in the kingdom of God. Acts of investiture or induction in the order of the world are not only symbolic—they are effectual, as carrying the sovereign authority. They change the man's position, giving him powers, possessions, and relations with others which he had not before, and which are thenceforth his by right, whatever use he may afterwards make of them. The disposition to use them worthily, the sense of the obligations which they impose, the spirit and character which respond to them, are not created by the grant, though it demands and suggests them. These have their recondite sources in the history and mystery of the moral being. It is the same in the higher region. There the spiritual rights are conferred by ordinance; the spiritual mind is generated by the Spirit of God. Where these concur the man is born anew of water and the Spirit. By Divine will each factor has its own necessity. Even if the work of the Spirit were sensibly manifest, it could not supersede the office of the sacrament. "Can any man," said St. Peter, "forbid the water, that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord."

A question follows as to the connection between these two constituents of regeneration. Is it simultaneous? Does the administration of the sacrament carry with it the action of the Spirit on the recipient in the way of inward change and renewal? It was a promise at the first baptism, "And ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost"—a promise which remains for evermore. And the reference to that gift in the same connection is frequent in the Epistles, and to "the laver of regeneration" is attached "the renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Titus iii. 5). But the promises do not fulfil themselves automatically, made as they are to human beings capable of desiring and claiming them; neither is there any assurance of simultaneous or immediate fulfilment, and the Spirit is said to breathe where it lists, like the free wind of heaven; and in multitudes of the baptized no manifestation of it appears, or not till time has passed. Moreover, it acts by the word in its operation on the heart and mind; and, as St. Peter says, the regenerate man is "begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of God living and abiding." We conclude, then, that the renewing Spirit is one of "the promises of God made in that sacrament," but not then and there fulfilled. In the case of the infant it could not be, unless by creation of a new nature—a notion as much at variance with Scripture as with reason and facts.

In reading the strong statements in the Epistles we think of them as exemplified in typical instances of the time. There is the convert from heathenism, whom the Word has reached and conquered, with all the darkness of his life behind him, coming to baptism in "the repentance whereby he forsakes sin, and faith whereby he steadfastly believes the promises of God made to him in that sacrament." Forgiveness of sin, membership in Christ, adoption as a child of God, the gift of the Spirit, are not his when he descends into the water; they are his by right when he emerges from it. The grace of the sacrament is discerned, not in impressive circumstances, or even in conscious experiences, but in the effectual grant which the Divine institution conveys. So Luther strenuously insists against depreciators of the ordinance in his time, "using," as he says, "such twaddle as this: How shall a handful of water help the soul? Wilt thou take away the costly part which God has attached to it, and in which He has set it? For the kernel in the water is God's word or commandment, and God's name. . . . From thence it derives its nature and is called a sacrament, as St. Augustine teaches: 'Accedat verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum.' . . . For through the Word it receives the power to become a washing of regeneration, as St. Paul calls it" ("The Greater Catechism: On Baptism").

That single word of St. Paul's (*παλιγγενεσία*) and another like word of St. Peter's (*αναγέννησις*), both intending the same metaphor, and fitly rendered by "regeneration," became in the Church familiar in their application to baptism as the sacrament of the new birth. So Justin Martyr, telling the Emperor how men were made Christians, after the mention of preceding confessions and devotions, concludes with the words: "Then are they led by us where there is water, and, in the manner of regeneration (*ἀναγεννήσεως*), in which also we ourselves were regenerated, are they regenerated. For in the name of the Lord God, Father of all, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, they then make the washing in the water" (Apol. i. 79).

But these general expressions take a more restricted meaning when we come to apply them to individual persons. Then the hypothetical element comes in—that which respects the spiritual state of the recipients. In regard to the earliest times the question scarcely occurs, on account of the securities which then existed. But even from the first there were doubtful characters, and later on, when manifold influences were at work, there was an ever-increasing number of cases in which baptism did not attest or create a regenerate condition of mind, as facts made manifest. Hence a sense of

the distinction between the grace proper to the sacrament and the spiritual condition of the recipient — the one a conveyance of the sure promises of God, the other inclusive of varieties and uncertainties in man. God judges the secrets of the heart; the Church only knows the man by his profession. The language of her offices is therefore in respect of the persons an assumption, in respect of the sacrament an assertion—on the one a judgment of charity, on the other a judgment of faith.

Of infant baptism, which practically concerns us, there is no need to speak particularly, since the view which has been taken of the whole subject allows an easy application to this branch of it. If the essential grace of the sacrament consists in the conferring of rights, powers, and relations, which by nature we cannot have, that is as possible for the child as for the man. It is so in the world—as in case of a legal adoption frequent in Eastern dynasties, infancy at the time is no bar to the validity of the Act. It is the same in the kingdom of God. If repentance and faith are required of those who come to be baptized, they are equally required of those who have been baptized; and if a defect of them in an adult at the time of baptism does not invalidate the sacrament for after-life, still less will incapacity for them in the child have that effect. In each case he inherits the promises when quickened into life by the baptism of the Spirit.

How or when it comes we know no law or prescription. The wind bloweth where it listeth in the mysterious world of mind and will. Its breath may be present from earliest consciousness, or break upon the soul in partial and interrupted gusts, or gradually make its way through reasoned convictions and felt necessities, or come at some critical hour with sudden distinctness and irrevocable determination. But, whenever or however it comes, the effect is still the same—a conscious contact with God in living relations with the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, and in the character which these create. This mind is not of man; it is begotten of God. Without it, notwithstanding the birth of water, there is no real entering into the kingdom. The right of entrance has been given, but the mind that enters is not there; and the Lord's word remains a witness and a warning—"Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born anew."

Nothing has been said here of one important feature of the rite—the promise and vow of the person baptized. There was no need to speak of it, as, with all its fulness of meaning, it raises no doubtful questions. Only a caveat may be entered against a way of thinking which regards the promises of God and those of man in the aspect of "a reciprocal con-

tract between two parties." Teaching of that kind has not been uncommon, and has perhaps found a starting-point in the phrase, "the Baptismal Covenant." It does not occur in our formularies, and, though in some sense useful, is capable of misleading suggestions of the kind just mentioned. It will not be so if we take the word "covenant" in its higher Scriptural sense—that of a sovereign act of God, creating relations with Himself, with the signs, sanctions, and charges that attend it. The promises of men, in return, are acknowledgments of the duties and acceptance of the obligations which ensue. Our duties arise out of our relations, as Bishop Butler observes, referring to our revealed relations with God in the Persons of the Trinity. These relations are revealed in the Gospel, but they are made our own in baptism, as the ordained admission into the covenant of grace. That involves corresponding duties on our part, accepted by promise and vow, to be fulfilled in obedience of faith. If the covenant of grace under which we have come elevates the standard of our obligations, it supplies proportionate resources for their fulfilment, and from the "sacrament of regeneration" we pass on into life, not only as children of nature, but as "thereby made the children of grace."

In conclusion, all that has been said may be summed up in words which were used at first. The essential grace of baptism consists in its character of initiation. The virtue of the act is in its relation to the state which it inaugurates. It associates the personal life with that supernatural scheme of things which rests on the basis of the Incarnation. It is the admission of the individual into the dispensation of covenanted grace which is in Christ Jesus. That admission is by Divine institution, and, being such, cannot be dispensed with, or superseded or repeated, and is effectual in conferring a right and interest in all the promises of God, promises, however, made to man under the necessary conditions of his nature, his self-determining power, his liberty, his responsibility, with their contingent consequences in actual life and in eternal judgment.

T. D. Bernard.

Art. II.—ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL AND MODERN CRITICISM.—V.

THE other prediction peculiar to Luke is in xix. 41-44. I have before taken exception to the manner in which in Hastings' Dictionary, *s.v.* "Gospels," we are told of "the greater precision with which the siege of Jerusalem is referred to than it is in Matthew and Mark (Luke xix. 43, xxi. 24)." As a fact, Matthew and Mark have nowhere any prophecy of the siege, and the incident of Christ weeping over Jerusalem is only recorded in the third Gospel. Here is the whole passage:

"And when He drew nigh, He saw the city and wept over it, saying, 'If thou hadst known in this thy day, even thou, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee when thine enemies shall cast up a bank about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall dash thee to the ground, and thy children within thee: and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation.'"

Now, there are really only two points of view from which such a record as the above can be logically treated. Those who accept the continuous teaching of the Church, that our Lord was empowered to utter prophecies, will see nothing to stumble at in His words being afterwards fulfilled by the events of A.D. 70. Those who deny our Lord such power will, of course, find the statement unhistorical, and they will doubtless extend the same criticism to our Lord's speech to the weeping daughters of Jerusalem (xxiii. 28-31) noticed in my third paper. The chasm is insuperable. On our side we shall have the fact that these fulfilled predictions were the support of the faith of the early Church, and that prophecy, like miracle, has ever been regarded as a "sign" of the Divine origin of the Christian revelation. Doubtless we may appeal to-day to proof of a higher moral kind. Nevertheless, there is no escape from the dilemma that either these "signs" were vouchsafed, or the grounds on which the first teachers of Christianity relied were utterly unsound. It is quite immaterial in this connection whether certain great German savants assign a late date to such passages *because* they embody fulfilled predictions. "What think ye of Christ?" is necessarily the question to be first answered. Repudiate the claims which the Church has ever made on His behalf, and there is necessarily an open field for destructive conjecture throughout the whole record of miracle and prophecy. Accept them, and there is none, except where there is reason to suspect the authority of the documentary testimony.

The passage cited above is in all MSS. and versions of a Gospel of whose authority no doubt was entertained. It falls into line with other primitive records of our Saviour's knowledge of the future and its general independence of the bounds of time and place. Thus, we find it distinctly stated in the Gospels that Christ had knowledge of Philip's conversation with Nathanael at a distance, and of the past life of the Samaritan woman; that He foresaw Peter's apostasy, repentance, and martyrdom; that He knew what should happen to Himself; that He foretold His Death, His Resurrection, and Ascension into Heaven; that He repeatedly predicted the inclusion of the Gentiles in His kingdom and the exclusion of the once favoured Jewish people; that He told men of His own Second Coming as the Judge of all mankind. Those who accept these powers as inherent in Christ's Personality will probably see little difficulty in believing that He foretold with some detail the siege and overthrow of Jerusalem. On the other hand, those who assume a naturalistic standpoint will logically expound the Church's story on the familiar naturalistic lines. Delusion and illusion will then be continually made the agencies which insured for Apostolic Christianity its successes. Miracles other than faith-healings will, on the most charitable assumption, be ascribed to misunderstanding and faulty records. Prophecies will at best be happy conjectures. If evidently fulfilled in detail in human experience, they must be "suspicious" and their recorder must write after their fulfilment.

These two alternatives are familiar to most of us. It is to be regretted that our modern English critics too frequently fail to distinguish this issue when discussing the dates of the Gospels. In Hastings, *s.v.* "Matthew," *Eschatological Standpoint and Date*, the authenticity of our Lord's predictions is not seriously discussed. The reader's attention is mainly directed to the interesting but not vital phenomenon that language similar to our Lord's occurs in the Apocalypse of Baruch. But as far as possible the date of the Gospel seems to be made to depend on the writer's experience of the things predicted. "Matthew repeats the warnings against being led away by rumours of Messiahs having been seen in various retired places (*cf.* Apoc. Bar., 48[34]) *so showing the topic of the hour when he wrote.*" [My italics.] "The urgency of the warnings against going after false Messiahs on the felt approach of the great national crisis (conceived of on the lines of Daniel's prophecy of Jerusalem's last trial and in terms of current apocalyptic based thereon) *points to the actual occasion which gave it birth.*" The conclusion is reached that Matthew writes in A.D. 68-69. I fail to see

how this is inferred from Matthew's presumed use of an apocalyptic book, which the critics date A.D. 50-65, and which may well be itself in part an echo of our Lord's eschatological teaching. But that Matthew must have conveniently unearthed such warnings on the approach of the great national crisis does not seem very distinguishable from the cruder German dictum that they were never uttered by Christ. It is apparently by the same considerations that the writer *s.v.* "Mark" is led to set the second Gospel "perhaps early in A.D. 70."[1] (The reader is left to reconcile this chronological scheme with the other. Both writers admit that Mark is the earliest of the Gospels, and the writer *s.v.* "Matthew" constantly assumes that this Evangelist made use of Mark.) Of Luke, as I have already noticed, we are told *s.v.* "Gospels," that the predictions seem to show that in this Gospel *the original form of the prophecy has been somewhat lost, owing to the knowledge of the particular circumstances of the event;*" and "somewhere about the year 80" is the date conjectured, *s.v.* "Luke."

I do not understand to what extent the authenticity of our Lord's predictions is acknowledged when thus much is postulated. But there is one which, if admitted, quite fails to square with this method of getting at the date of the recorder from the predictions he records. It is our Lord's prophecy of the fate of the Temple. While the Temple was standing in its splendour, Jesus is said to have warned His hearers that "there shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." Matthew and Mark record this as well as Luke, and it is as striking a prediction as can be conceived. Bring the Gospels down even to "early in A.D. 70," and we are still not within range of the probability of its fulfilment. For the fate of the Temple was no natural outcome of the "great national crisis." Even after the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem there was no reason to anticipate its demolition. It was not the Roman practice to destroy such edifices, and Titus was most anxious to save it. The destruction of the cloisters was begun by the Jews themselves. When the Holy Place was endangered by the spread-

[1] The arbitrary character of these modern assignments of date is here illustrated by the comment: "There is no passage which clearly means or certainly implies that the fall of Jerusalem and the Temple was an accomplished fact. If so great a catastrophe in Jewish history had taken place within recent or a comparatively recent period, there would have been indications of it in less obscure forms in the earliest of the Gospels." One is naturally led to remark that the fourth Gospel, which all agree was written after A.D. 70, has not a single "indication" that the Temple lay in ruins at the time of writing.

ing flames, Titus sent troops to extinguish them. Lured, however, by hope of plunder, they deliberately disobeyed his orders. More than this, it might be said that it was not till the time of Hadrian that the prophecy was completely fulfilled. The site of the Holy Place was, at least, at that time recognisable, and it was dedicated to Jupiter Capitolinus in A.D. 136.

Now, the critics do not date Matthew's Gospel after the destruction of the Temple, because in Matt. xxiv. 29 we have the judgment discourse interwoven with the prediction of the fall of Jerusalem in such sort that the fearful signs of the end of the world are regarded as occurring "*immediately* after the tribulation of those days." This misunderstanding on the part of some of our Lord's hearers is of service to us to-day. It is recognised that Matthew could not have written thus after A.D. 70. Here, then, is an event not in the least within men's cognizance, and far more improbable than the rise of false prophets or the siege of Jerusalem and deportation of Jewish captives. If in the one case we take the position that the Evangelist's record is not conditioned by experience, why not in the others? If this striking prophecy of the obliteration of the Temple stands, why should we not believe, as our forefathers did, that Matthew's prediction of the false prophets in no way bears on the date of his Gospel, or Luke's prediction of the siege on the date of his? Indeed, one may go further, and say that, so far from there being any real indication that Matthew writes in an atmosphere of false prophets and profanations of the Temple, his antecedence to the years 68-70 and his inexperience of the occurrence of the events predicted are really on rationalistic lines the best conclusion. For it is extremely improbable that a historian "on the felt approach of the great national crisis" should boldly associate it with a forecast of the "immediate" ending of the world. A Matthew writing in this way in 68-69 must have in two years' time found his interpretation of current events completely falsified, and the more we postulate of such interpretation, the more must the credit of his Gospel have been impaired. From this point of view there is more difficulty in making him write in the midst of the Jewish troubles than before them. I may add that the ecclesiastical note, "let him that readeth understand," attached in both Matthew and Mark to the prediction of the "abomination of desolation" profaning the Temple, seems to give the same chronological indication. As there are no such comments elsewhere in the Gospels, we cannot attribute these words to the Evangelists. They are obviously an ecclesiastical note dating from the period when the prediction was being ful-

filled.[1] They thus bespeak a time when the Gospels had attained a circulation in the Church as recognised authoritative literature. This condition is best satisfied by supposing some years to elapse between the dates of the Gospels and the date of the fulfilment of the prediction.

This is not a paper on prophecy, but it is well, perhaps, to recall the fact that it is impossible to eliminate the prophetic element from the two revelations in our Bible, and that we are inextricably committed to the reality of this "sign" both in the Old Testament and the New. The Church's position on this subject is attested, not by mere *obiter dicta*, but by the Nicene Creed itself. The generations that succeeded the Apostles were, of course, convinced in this matter; and it is interesting to recall how those very predictions in the Gospels which are now so arbitrarily treated as "showing the topic of the hour" when their recorder wrote were used as Christian apologia. I will quote two instances only of this common practice. The prediction above cited in regard to the false prophets is used by Justin Martyr for argumentative purposes thus in his dialogue with Trypho (chap. lxxxii.):

"We know that He foreknew all that would happen to us after His Resurrection from the dead and Ascension into heaven. For He said we would be put to death and hated for His Name's sake. And that many false prophets and false Christs would appear in His Name and deceive many. And so it has come about."

So, again, in the Clementine Homilies (chap. xv.) we have a citation of the predictions of the siege in Luke xix., which, although the writer was probably an Ebionite, is sufficiently illustrative of the universal belief:

"But our Master being a Prophet by an inborn and ever-flowing spirit, and knowing all things at all times, He confidently set forth plainly, as I said before, sufferings, places, appointed times, manners, limits. Accordingly, therefore, prophesying of the Temple, He said: 'See ye these buildings? Verily I say to you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another which shall not be taken away, and this generation shall not pass until the destruction begin. For they shall come and sit here, and shall besiege it, and shall slay your children here.' And in like manner He spoke in plain words the things that were straightway to happen, which we can now see with our eyes, in order that the accomplishment might be among those to whom the word was spoken."

The question to-day is whether this belief of the Early Church, which is repeatedly referred to in after-times[2] as a confirmation of men's faith, was, after all, unwarranted. Obviously, such arguments lose much of their force if a

[1] See Alford, note on Matt. xxiv. 15.

[2] Compare, *e.g.*, the use of the prophecies in Luke xix., xxi., in Eusebius, "H. E.," bk. iii., c. 7.

Trypho or other adversary could reply: "But the Evangelists may have embellished these predictions by their experience of the particular circumstances of the event"; or, "They wrote them on the felt approach of the great national crisis . . . in terms of current apocalyptic." Justin, at least, must be credited with much more knowledge of the state of things in Palestine in A.D. 68-70 than our modern critics. How is it no such alternative seems to present itself to the minds of those who thus relied on the predictions presented in our Gospels? Is it likely that an argument which the early Church so confidently pressed could be so easily overturned by a little more attention to the history of the Gospels?

We cannot, I maintain, allow the reality of prophecy in one case and question it in another; cede such a striking prediction as that of the speedy obliteration of the Temple, and argue that the other details of our Lord's prophecies show that the Evangelists who record them must have had experience of their fulfilment. In the case of all three Evangelists, there is really no indication that they did not write some five years before the national crisis of A.D. 68-70; and in Luke's case, as I have shown, there is reason to think that he writes not later than the year 63, and that the Acts followed the Gospel not later than A.D. 68. No argument can be drawn from the predictions. Even if the Evangelists wrote as late as the critics suppose, it would be a large assumption that the predictions remained not recorded in writing until that time, and a quite unwarrantable one that, if the Evangelists found them in writing, they would modify them by their own experiences. I may notice in this connection that Luke elsewhere seems to present predictions uncoloured by facts that were certainly within his knowledge. By his honesty elsewhere his record of Christ's predictions must be estimated if we are to deal fairly. Thus, the predictions of chap. i. indicate only the Baptist's work as Christ's forerunner, but say nothing of his martyrdom. The prediction of Agabus in Acts xi. 38 is quite indefinite in Luke's presentation of it. We are merely told that this prophet "signified by the Spirit that there should be a great famine over all the world, which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar." More important for my present purpose is that other prediction of this same Agabus in Acts xxi. 11 concerning Paul's own sufferings, and the limited degree of prophetic inspiration attributed to the Apostle himself in Acts xx. 23. Agabus' prediction is confined to the part played by the Jews of Jerusalem who should "bind the man which owneth this girdle, and deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles." In the other passage Paul is informed by the

Holy Spirit only to the degree of knowledge "that in every city bonds and afflictions abide" him. Now, these accounts of prophetic inspiration were written, on the critical assumption, several years after Paul's death. One may fairly argue that, if Luke was the sort of historian to embellish Christ's own prophecies, it is strange that he, writing with a full knowledge of Paul's imprisonments and final martyrdom, presents the subject with such limitations. Indeed, the critical canons with which the Gospel narratives are now approached seem here to be dangerous weapons to handle. To borrow the one I recently quoted: "If so great a catastrophe" as the execution of Luke's chief character "had taken place . . . there would have been indications of it" in the Acts. There are certainly none. On the critics' own principles, then, the Acts, and therefore the third Gospel, too, should be dated before Paul's martyrdom, and consequently before the fall of Jerusalem.

I must now bring this necessarily sketchy presentation of the claims of the third Gospel to a conclusion. From a merely common-sense point of view it would seem highly improbable that a work so early and widely set on a level with the Apostles' own writings was only of secondary authority. It was certainly more easy for the second century than it is for the twentieth to distinguish the claims of this book. Were Luke's position assailable, it is curious that neither then nor in the fourth century, when the limitations of the New Testament Canon were much discussed, is it ever assailed. Contrariwise, Marcion (*circa* A.D. 144), the heretical impugner of the Gospel Canon, attaches particular dignity to the third Gospel. Tatian's "Diatessaron," written before A.D. 170, shows us how widely the equal authority of the four Gospels was recognised. At the beginning of the third century the almost superstitious respect paid to the quaternion of Gospels is expressed in Irenæus' well-known comparison of the four living creatures about the throne of God. It is recognised as part of God's ordering that there should be four, and only four, authoritative Gospels. The Church, however uncritical in her accounts of their origin, is convinced not only that they express the teaching of the Apostles, but that they themselves indicate a special guidance of the Holy Spirit.

This last point of view I have kept out of consideration. I have endeavoured to show what Luke's claims are for one who only postulates, as Godet does, "that the authors of our Gospels were men of good sense and good faith." Prophecy apart, there appears to be nothing in all the minute analysis that the Gospels have sustained to alter our old ideas as to their

dates. On the other hand, the same dividing line between critics will probably be recognised as in Archbishop's Thomson's excellent account of Luke's Gospel in the old "Smith's Dictionary of the Bible," *s.v.* "Luke." "It is painful to remark," he says, "how the opinions of many commentators who refuse to fix the date of this Gospel earlier than the destruction of Jerusalem have been influenced by the determination that nothing like prophecy shall be found in it. Believing that our Lord did really prophesy that event, we have no difficulty in believing that an Evangelist reported the prophecy before it was fulfilled." Much has been claimed as scientific discovery which really only rests upon modifications of this determination. The necessity of reshaping our ideas of ancient Hebrew history by the light of the Higher Criticism has given this mood a certain vantage-ground, it being forgotten that the literary conditions of the Old Testament writings are totally different from those of the New. Chancellor Lias, however, has done good service in showing us in the CHURCHMAN how arbitrary and unauthorized are many of the dicta of the critics even in that less familiar province. Whatever the ultimate verdict there, it is at least worth noticing that the tide of criticism in regard to our New Testament books is, by the confession of Professor Harnack himself, setting "back to tradition." It is no longer deemed honest criticism to assume wherever convenient that Pauline Epistles are forgeries in Paul's name; indeed, there is an increasing tendency to treat the investigation of the authenticity of our Christian literature with the same fairness as is demanded in matters secular. The German dicta for the future will, we are told, be: "It is not the miracles that matter." "Differences are henceforward likely to appear in the interpretation of books rather than in the problems of their date and authenticity."[1] With a caveat in regard to certain dates, we accept the omen, not unmindful of the critical verdicts of thirty years ago. The important fact that the first teachers of Christianity did (wisely or unwisely) *believe* in miracles and prophecy is now unchallenged. One day, perhaps, such post-dating of predictions as I have noticed in these papers will be deemed as palpable a *petitio principii* as the once familiar device of denying Paul the authorship of the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians because they showed the antiquity of that belief, and so far confirmed the Gospel story.[2]

ARTHUR C. JENNINGS.

[1] Quotations from Harnack in an article on "New Testament Criticism," *Quarterly Review*, January, 1903.

[2] In that once popular work, "Supernatural Religion" (1874) we were told that the "Gospel miracles stand upon no other testimony"; "there

ART. III.—THE AUTHORITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.—II.

I HAVE already pointed out the extremely unsatisfactory nature of the so-called proofs on which the recent criticism of the Old Testament is based, and which the Bishop of Ripon, in his Preface to the "Temple Bible," believes to have been established. He says, in p. 78, though without giving his grounds for the remark, "We may follow the critics" in their assertion that "the mass of the laws and ceremonies which meet us in the Pentateuch belong to a later date than Moses." We shall see in a moment what ground there is for accepting their unproved sayings.

The first ground on which we are asked to sit at the feet of the critics is that all "scholars" are "agreed" on the points which have been mentioned. As this fact is arrived at by the summary process of denying the title of "scholar" to everyone who does not "agree" with these conclusions, this argument is not very conclusive, save to those who have made up their mind beforehand to accept it. If, indeed, those who dispute the assertions of the disciples of Wellhausen were contented to denounce those assertions on the *a priori* ground that they are opposed to "the traditions of the elders" on these subjects, there might be some reason for setting aside all objections as the clamours of ignorant and prejudiced men. But as these conclusions have been carefully examined by competent persons, and have been pronounced not to be in harmony with the facts, it might, perhaps, be found better to read both sides before pronouncing for either.[1]

---

is no other contemporary evidence whatever" (vol. i., p. 208). This conclusion was reached by coolly ignoring, not only the Acts of the Apostles, but also such older and undeniably Pauline writings as Rom. xv. 18, 19, 2 Cor. xii. 12, which sufficiently prove the antiquity of the "miraculous pretensions" of the Church. The whole testimony of the Epistles was, in fact, brushed aside thus: "It is clear from the words of the Apostle Paul in 2 Thess. ii. 2, iii. 17, that his Epistles were falsified"; "spurious Epistles were long ascribed to him" (vol. ii., p. 169). It is instructive to remember that such was the mood of the German rationalists thirty years ago, and that this English embodiment of it was considered a masterpiece of scholarly criticism, and rapidly ran through six editions.

[1] As a matter of fact, scholars—even German scholars—are not agreed on the subject, nor is it quite honest to represent them as being so. Professor Dillmann, whose authority as a critic is not questioned by the disciples of Wellhausen, denies that the "Priestly Code" is post-exilic, and holds it to be the earliest of the Hebrew histories. Professor König, of Bonn, has written *Bibel und Babel* in reply to the *Babel und Bibel* of Professor Delitzsch the younger; and he contends that the Israelite early monotheistic narratives are not derived from the polytheistic Babylonian ones. And the S.P.C.K. has just published some remarks

But, we are further told, the leading Hebraists of the day have accepted the conclusions of the great Semitic scholar Wellhausen, and therefore the question is settled. Not quite, I venture to say in arrest of judgment. No doubt this is in many ways an age of progress, but I think that in some ways it is more difficult just now to obtain a full consideration of a question from all sides than it ever has been. At one time its novelty was a sufficient reason for rejecting a theory. That, of course, was not a fair way of treating a question. At the present moment novelty is very often almost the only recommendation a theory has. I could mention many instances of the manner in which, in these days, when a theory holds the field by reason of the pronouncements of a few leading scholars, it is considered heresy to dissent from it. Many men of more capacity than courage, though their better judgment would lead them to reject the prevalent opinion, dare not face the combination in its favour, but shrink from the contempt and something approaching to ostracism with which the dissenter is received. You can see, in the utterances of such men, the half-hearted manner in which the view which for the moment is popular is stated. It is not contradicted; indeed, in a vague sort of way, it is accepted. But those who read between the lines can see that the class of writers whom I have in my mind would abandon it if they dare. It is a mistake to suppose that investigators are independent in these days. They never were less so. In days past it was heresy to dispute any conviction traditionally held. In these times it is heresy to reject the latest fashion in Biblical criticism or theology. It holds the field without a rival for some ten or fifteen years. It is then replaced by another, equally novel, equally daring, and equally unsound.

But, at least, say those who have no time to go into the subject, "the experts are agreed." Is this so? *What* experts? Is a vast question of this kind to be settled by a handful of Hebrew and Arabic scholars and textual critics? Why, even Wellhausen has admitted that the linguistic argument is the weakest point in the investigation.[1] But the question is not merely a linguistic one; it is one of the widest description. It is a historical question. It is a literary question. It is a question which concerns the student of comparative religions. It is one which touches the origin of theism. It touches on a hundred other points, each of them

by Professor Kilbel, another distinguished Biblical critic, in which he rejects the criticism which all "scholars" are "agreed" to accept.

[1] He may well say so, when a scholar such as Dillmann assigns an early origin to what, in Wellhausen's opinion, is the latest of the Hebrew historic documents.

of vast importance. What equipment, I should like to know, have *any* of the men whose writings have come to the front in this great inquiry for researches whose ramifications are so endless? Linguistic problems? Historical problems? Why, many of these men cannot read either the cuneiform script or the Egyptian hieroglyphics! And yet they have treated Babylonian scholars such as Sayce and Hommel with scorn. Historical research? Why, there is scarcely a historical scholar of note who has pronounced in their favour. Freeman, one of our greatest English historians, expressed his doubt of the soundness of their methods. Stubbs, even a saner and sounder historian still, declares that such methods would be laughed out of court by all genuine historical scholars. You may have observed what he is quoted in the *Times* of March 3, 1903, as saying of modern Biblical research. Dean Milman would have none of it. Sir George Cornewall Lewis, a great historical scholar, said that there was certainly progress in connection with similar German theories of Roman history, but it was "progress in a circle." Literary criticism! Is there any literary critic, save some eccentric Germans, who has attempted in the literature of any country but Judæa to produce a mosaic (in another sense) such as meets us in Rainbow Bibles and the like? or, having ventured to produce it, has dared to say that he had established his theories? In his work on Homer Sir R. Jebb says that though there have doubtless been additions to the original fabric of the Iliad, yet one could only indicate their larger features, and all attempts to pursue them into detail have proved failures. Professor Henry Morley laughs to scorn the German critic who would deal with the poems of Beowulf as Professor Driver would have us deal with the Books of Moses.[1] And the smile of contempt with which the literary world of England, Christian and sceptical, with Mr. Andrew Lang at its head, received the Rainbow and Polychrome Bibles on their appearance is a decisive verdict by real experts on the fitness of these gentlemen for the literary criticism of which they speak so confidently. We may be pretty sure that we shall see no more "Rainbow" or "Polychrome" Bibles published. They let rather too much of the light of day upon the "results" on which all "scholars" are agreed. The "results" stand a chance of being imposed on us by bold assertion. But they will never be so imposed unless the processes by which they are obtained remain in the background. The more we know of them, the less we shall like them. And yet the J and E and D and P theory, which the Bishop

[1] See my "Principles of Biblical Criticism," Appendix C.

of Ripon tells us we may fairly endorse, entirely rests upon these literary curiosities, so unanimously rejected by the literary world. Nor are these one-sided theorists more fortunate in other directions. The Bishop of Ripon tells us on their authority (p. 69) that "Israel became a Monotheist people." But Professor Caldecott, in his recent able work on the "Philosophy of Religion," tells us that modern opinion is inclining to the view that the religion of primitive man was monotheistic. Other writers of eminence have said the same thing. Thus the monotheism of Israel may have been a reformation, not a discovery. Yet the Bishop of Ripon assumes the contrary. Are we to follow the experts only when they pronounce in one direction—only when they make their assertions with sufficient boldness or loudness? This may be convenient in the present day, when everyone is in a hurry. But it is neither a philosophical nor an impartial treatment of the subject. The comparatively new study of psychology has also something to do with the matter in hand—not the very peculiar process called "psychological criticism" by Professor Cheyne, but a consideration of the conditions of mind and soul essential to the reception and spread of a revelation or a religion, and the formation of moral and religious character in connection with it. Thus the problem of the history and character of David, intelligible enough on the traditional view of the Scripture history, becomes a well-nigh insoluble problem if we assume that Israel was in his day slowly emerging from the gross and sensual Semitic polytheism into monotheism, and that all the moral and religious light possessed by him was contained in the 20th to the 23rd chapters of Exodus inclusive.[1]

I cannot but feel astonishment that the conclusions of the Wellhausen school have been so readily received by candid and intelligent men. For the merest tyro in historical investigation can see, if he stops to consider the matter, on what a slender basis of fact they rest. It is easy enough to reconstruct history in any shape we wish, provided we can strike out any passages in it which conflict with our theories. And that this is the way the theories are established any reader of Professor Driver's Introduction can see for himself. The Book of Joshua, for instance, represents Joshua as invading Palestine with the "Book of the Law" in his hands for

[1] See Professor König, *Bibel und Babel*, p. 49. He points out that the moral tendency of a religion is illustrated, not by what men do, but by *whether they are blamed* for what they do or not. He further instances the case of Tamar, described as unheard of in Israel, as a proof of the wide distinction between Jewish and general Semitic morality.

counsel and for guidance. Not so, says Professor Driver. He had nothing of the kind. That statement is an addition of the Deuteronomist. The Book of Judges is not to be accepted as a veracious narrative. The "Deuteronomic compiler," says the Professor, has "taken a series of independent narratives," and "arranged them in a framework," "exhibiting a theory of the occasion and nature of the work which the Judges were called upon to undertake." In plain English, every statement in the Book of Judges which conflicts with the J, E, D, and P theory is to be struck out. If the Books of Kings inveigh consistently throughout against the worship at the "high places," this is a misstatement which we owe to the "compiler."[1] Once more the history is to be mutilated in order to support Professor Driver's theory. The account of Solomon's reign, with its establishment of the Temple as the permanent centre of the religious life of Israel, is found to be also plainly to a great extent the work of a later hand, to whom once more the account of Jeroboam's institution of the worship of the golden calves must be attributed. Thus the way in which the fact that worship at the central sanctuary was not prescribed till the reign of Josiah is established is by simply striking out every passage which asserts that it *was* so prescribed. The witness of the prophets, too, to the fact that Israelite institutions are due in the main to Moses is explained away, or its meaning is strained by the most extraordinary *tours de force*. Is this legitimate criticism, or is it license of the gravest kind, to which no serious historian would think of resorting for a moment? Nor is there the slightest attempt to explain how these "workings over" and "settings" of the "compiler"—deliberate falsifications as they appear to me to be—came to be accepted by the Jews as veracious history. The history of other countries, as handed down by them, is regarded as an approximation to the truth, as correct in all its main features. In the case of the Jews alone, the most important of all, and the most entirely under Divine guidance, is the history they have handed down not only not an approximation to the truth, but, in all its main features, a direct contradiction of it. In other histories, too, the assertions of critics are usually supported by evidence. In Jewish history there is not a shred of direct evidence either for the existence or date of the Jehovist, the Elohist, the Deuteronomist, the author or compiler of the "Priestly Code," or for any compilation at any period of their various works. And when we read of the conflicts of Jeremiah with the king,

[1] Professor König denies this point-blank (*Bibel und Babel*, p. 12), yet "the critics are agreed"!

the courtiers, and the false prophets, we find that it is he who appeals consistently throughout to the ancient history of his country, and they whom he convicts as having departed from it. Were the Jews of his day as ignorant of the history of their country as this criticism supposes them to have been?

I have had to compress most closely all I have said. I could have said a good deal more did time only permit. I could point out how a vast deal of the critical structure raised with such care and pains is based on the denial of prophecy and miracle, and how the theory of evolution is assumed by the Bishop of Ripon, as well as others, to exclude all possibility of intervention from on high—a proposition neither true in history nor science.

I might say a good deal about the place of oral tradition in matters of history. Thus, I myself heard from my father, who had received it from *his* father, an account of the Gordon riots of 1784, agreeing with the description of them I had read, and what seemed to me exaggerated and improbable in the written accounts was confirmed to me by oral testimony. I have children of ten and eleven years old to-day to whom I have handed down that testimony. I once had an interview with an old man who was at the Battle of Trafalgar, and he gave me an account of the battle which agreed verbally with the statement of histories he had never read. Can one suppose for a moment that when the "Book of the Law" was found in the Temple in the reign of Josiah, that monarch had not plenty of oral testimony at hand as to the nature of the religious institutions of Judah in the days of his great-grandfather?

I might again appeal to recent controversy to show that the very methods, the soundness of which are admitted by various writers not very closely acquainted with the subject, in the case of the Old Testament, are rejected by them in the case of the New. Just one word on this point. Professor Sanday has recently expressed publicly his regret at the utterances of Canon Henson on the Virgin birth of Christ. I cannot help expressing my regret that Canon Sanday has in the past thrown the ægis of his authority over Old Testament critics who claim a right to strike out of the Hebrew records any statement of facts which conflicts with the conclusions they desire to establish. He has now found that the same methods which he has declined to condemn when applied to the Old Testament are applied to the New. And he is forced now—all too late, as it seems to me—to raise his voice against such a mode of dealing with the Word of God. I should also like just to allude to a declaration I have seen in a recent review by Professor W. B. Smith that "Romans

is visibly, in every chapter, not an original unit, but a compilation of pre-existent materials." It "exhibits on every page the most indubitable marks of redaction." There is in it "a diversity of style without parallel in any original work." Here we have the methods of the "Rainbow" and "Polychrome" Bible over again. There is no proof whatever of these statements. It is so because Professor Smith says it is so. And it is precisely the same with the fourfold division of the Pentateuch which the Bishop of Ripon recommends us to accept. It is so because Wellhausen and Professor Driver say it is so. But, I repeat, it is no proof to point out certain difficulties in the narrative as it stands, and then to proceed to strike out from that narrative everything which prevents you from contradicting it. We have at least a right to ask the Bishop of Ripon to tell us what distinction there is between the reasoning of Professor Driver and of Professor Smith. Time, alas! forbids me to enter fully into these questions, as interesting and important as any on which I have been able to touch.

I am sorry that the recent wave of scepticism has swept over so many of those whose position would entitle them to be leaders of religious thought. I do not go so far as to accuse them of being sceptics. But I *do* accuse them of giving too easy credence to statements, and of being too ready to admit principles, which tend to undermine the authority of Holy Writ. The question practically comes to this: Is revelation objective or subjective? In other words, Did God speak authoritatively to man, or did man, by his own care and pains and research, discover the Divine Voice in writings which have come down to him? In the violence of a reaction from the tendency to exaggerate the extent, and misunderstand the nature of miracles and the supernatural, and to deny the presence of a human element in Scripture, a school of thinkers at the Universities and elsewhere is at present inclined to go too far in the other direction. I have no hesitation in saying that the indisposition of the laity to attend church is very largely due to the excess of freedom with which for some years the Scriptures have been treated. People have been taught to disbelieve their authority, and, naturally, they have drawn the inference that there can be but little in the religion the statements of whose sacred writings are worthy of so little credence. But though the ancient landmarks are invisible, because the floods of the critical spirit are everywhere hiding them from view, I have little fear for the future. In matters connected with the soul men crave for authority, not argument. If they are thirsting for the water of life, they will prefer the old Bible to the new criticism. The instinct of

the community at large will continue to supply the corrective to the violence of a stream which has burst its bounds. There must be authority somewhere in religion, or there is no such thing as revelation. Man's reason is too contracted, too undisciplined, to reach the depths of the Infinite. The human conscience seeks to hear the voice of God speaking in unmistakable accents to mankind. The present gross exaggeration of the function of criticism in relation to Divine truth will, like other human systems, "have its day and cease to be." But the Church of God as a whole will never lose sight of the fundamental fact that when God has thought fit to speak man must listen and adore. Human reason may seek to interpret His utterances, it may endeavour to comprehend the conditions under which they were made, but it must not question the authority of the utterances themselves. The whole Bible as it stands, from Genesis to Revelation, plainly states that God revealed Himself to mankind in a certain order and in a certain way. It is not open to us, as members of the Christian Church, to contest this statement. If human ingenuity finds difficulties in it, we may be sure that those difficulties will be ultimately resolved. As St. Peter tells us, when God speaks "man is not entitled to put his own value on the utterance. For from no human will did His Voice proceed, but men borne along by the Holy Spirit spoke from God."[1]

J. J. Lias.

Art. IV.—THE INCARNATION BY VIRGIN BIRTH ONLY.

IF Jesus had been the son of Joseph and Mary, He would have been, like all others who have been born of two human parents, a person. But the Word, Who was in the beginning, and was with God, and was God, was also a person. Hence, if the Word could have become incarnate in the son of Joseph, there would have been a junction of two distinct persons in one body, each a distinct *ego*, each self-conscious. The Son of God could not have been the son of Joseph; the son of Joseph could not have been the Son of God. The conversation between our Lord and the blind man whom He had healed would have been impossible. "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" He said. The man answered: "And

[1] 2 Pet. i. 20, 21: *πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς, ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται. Οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη ποτὲ προφητεία, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ Πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι.*

who is He, Lord, that I may believe on Him?" Jesus said unto him: "Thou hast both seen Him, and it is He that speaketh with thee." But the man would see the son of Joseph, not the Son of God; and though the words might express the thoughts of the Son of God, the sounds which the man heard would have been the voice of the son of Joseph. Such a junction would not have been an incarnation, but a possession—like the other possessions which we read of in the Gospels, except that they were possessions by evil spirits, and this would have been by a good spirit. When our Saviour said to the Jews, "Before Abraham was, I am," He would have been misleading them, for they would naturally suppose that the speaker was the man whom they saw; whereas the man whom they saw—the son of Joseph—would have been overmastered and silenced by the Son of God, and compelled, as a mere instrument, to say things which—as those who heard them were obliged to understand them—would not have been true. Instead of incarnation, there would have been impersonation.

"Which of you convicteth Me of sin?" How could such a question have been asked honestly, when the man whom the hearers saw had, whether they had seen it or not, committed sin like all other men, unless, indeed, we invent an immaculate conception for the child of Joseph and Mary?

Why do I go into these hateful details? Because I wish to show that the false incarnation involves far more difficulties than the true. Our Lord's favourite title was Son of man; but on the impersonation theory He was not Son of man, but Son of God only. The son of Joseph had no more power to forgive sins than any other man. When one man forgives another, and says so, is it his tongue and his other vocal organs that forgive, or is it the person, the man himself, who forgives, and uses his voice just as he might have used, for the same purpose and to the same effect, pen and paper?

"This is My body which is given for you." But under the false incarnation it would not have been the body of the Son of God, but only the body of the son of Joseph; and so we should come to the ancient heresy, that it was not the Christ that was crucified, but someone else in His stead. "Suffered for us under Pontius Pilate" would be all a mistake. The son of Joseph would have suffered, died, and been buried; whether it is possible for a Person of the Holy Trinity to suffer by sympathy we cannot tell. It is quite impossible for him to be crowned with thorns, buffeted and spit upon, scourged and crucified, unless he is something more than the *Logos*, the Thought and Utterance of the Almighty.

When our Lord said to Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger,

and see My hands," and "Reach hither thy hand, and put it into My side," He would have been deceiving Thomas as much as Jacob deceived Isaac. The hand and the sides would not have been His, but those of the man who was crucified.

Why should the son of Joseph be taken up to heaven? Would the Divine Word need to wear a bodily mask among the angels? How could He who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh be declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead, unless He had been the Son of God from His conception? How could the son of Joseph and Mary be the Lamb of God, any more than the son of Abraham was, or the ram that was offered in his stead? Look at the wonderful figure in the first chapter of the Revelation. John, who wrote that chapter, had known intimately both Jesus and His Mother. Could he, unless quite bereft of his senses, have described that figure as once dead, and afterwards alive for evermore, and having the keys of death and Hades—nay, as the First and the Last and the Living One—if he who died and lived again had had his beginning like all other men, and He who was the First and the Last and the Living One was an entirely different person, who had chosen to dwell in the other, but was not and could not be the same with him?

And what will be the relation of Christian people to Jesus if He is no more than an impotent screen or mask through which the Son of God speaks to us? How can we have that mind in us which was also in Him, who, being in the form of God, emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, if He did not really humble Himself to die on the cross, but compelled Joseph's son to die on it, stifling any remonstrance which he might make, and so bringing him as a dumb lamb to the slaughter, either against his will or by overmastering his will? Even if the man's will was overmastered by a spiritual revelation of divine love, as the wills of martyrs have been, still, Joseph's son would only be the prince of martyrs, not at all that divine person whom Christians have hitherto believed to have been Himself the sufferer. In that case, all the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews falls to the ground. The sacrifice for sins was only symbolical, like those under the law—one more victim added to the number of those which could never take away sins. When we pray to Christ, which Christ do we pray to—the son of Joseph, or the Son of God? Which are we to have in us as our hope of glory? When we go to the Lord's Table, it is not His own body and blood that the Lord offers us, it seems, but the body and blood of a mere man like ourselves.

No doubt it is profoundly possible that a man can become

a son of God. Besides that sonship, which we all have by creation, there is another sonship by water and the Spirit. But this is not incarnation, and to accomplish that there is no revealed process, except that by which the Son, Who is the Word of the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, of her substance.

Little did Newman think, when he wrote his first Tract in 1833, that now, in 1903, such things should happen in the Church of England as the pitiful doings at St. Michael's, Shoreditch, and the more pitiful belittling of the Virgin birth of Jesus! But the seed of Tract XC. was in Tract I.; and Tract XC. contained the seed, not only of St. Michael's, Shoreditch, but also of that illusory incarnation which is now being substituted for the birth of the Son of God. If clergymen may explain away the anti-papal Articles, they may explain away the Incarnation. Far as the two explanations may seem from each other, they probably have a common source, and they certainly tend in one direction. If men can no longer be sure that they have a Saviour in the Church of England, some of them will seek one in the Church of Rome. Better, they will say, to believe too much than to remain in a communion whose pastors and masters play fast and loose with the very foundation of Christianity; while others will probably drift away into an aimless and hopeless agnosticism, with no better guide to morals than impulse or fashion.

J. FOXLEY.

ART. V.—THE VALUE OF PROPHECY AS AN EVIDENCE OF REVELATION.

THE final discourses of our Lord to His disciples afford a remarkable illustration of the practical value of prophecy as an evidence of revelation. Three times in these discourses does He impress on them the fact that He was warning them beforehand of what was about to come to pass, in order that, when it had come to pass, they might believe. The first instance is when He is referring to His approaching betrayal. "The Scripture," He said, "will be fulfilled: he that eateth bread with Me, hath lifted up his heel against Me. And now I tell you before it come to pass, that, when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am He." The second instance is in reference to His approaching departure. "Ye have heard how I said, I go away and come again unto you. And now," He adds, "I have told you before it come to pass, that, when it is come to pass, ye might believe." The third follows in

the same discourse, when He is warning His disciples of the persecution which awaited them. "These things," He said, "will they do unto you because they have not known the Father nor Me. But these things have I told you that, when the time is come, ye may remember that I told you of them." The Apostles were about to witness and to experience circumstances of the strangest and most painful nature. They were to see their Master, whom they believed in as the Christ of God, betrayed by one of themselves, and delivered over to a shameful death; and though He rose again and ascended to heaven in glory, yet when they came forward to proclaim His exaltation, they would be excommunicated by the leaders of their people, and whosoever killed them would think that he did God service. Their hopes and their convictions were thus to undergo a succession of the most grievous disappointments, and the most severe strain would be put upon their faith. What considerations were to sustain them under it? Our Lord gives them various assurances of comfort; but the one which He thus reiterates three times over must have been intended by Him to be of special importance. This was, that nothing would happen to Himself or to them which He had not foretold. They might, therefore, be assured that it was compatible with other truths which He proclaimed to them, and particularly with their belief that He was their Divine Lord and Master. They would have good reason to feel that the trials which befell them, however distressing, were part of a dispensation foreseen and intended by their Master, and their confidence in Him and His guidance ought thus to be the more firmly established.

In these simple words our Lord has supplied the key to the question of the office and use of prophecy. In previous papers the cardinal facts of prophecy and its general nature have been considered. It has been shown how, as a matter of fact, long before our Lord's appearance, it had pointed to the coming of a Person who should fulfil towards mankind the offices which He came to discharge, and also that it had not merely pointed forward to this supreme fact, but that its voice had accompanied every step in the history of the people of Israel, from the time when Abraham was called by this process to leave his Father's house, to the time when Malachi uttered the concluding predictions of the old dispensation. According to the conviction of the Jews of our Lord's day, as illustrated in St. Stephen's speech, the whole life of the Jewish people depended on the truth that the God of glory had from time to time appeared to their fathers, declaring to them at once their destiny and their duty, and upon those revelations of prophecy St. Stephen rested his belief in the

truth he proclaimed, that our Lord had established a spiritual worship which was independent of the local and temporary ordinances of the Jewish sanctuary. This was the settled belief of the Jews of our Lord's day, alike of St. Stephen and the Apostles on the one hand, and of those who rejected their message on the other. The only point in dispute between them was as to the interpretation of those prophecies, not as to their reality.

But let us next consider what is the use which such prophecies serve in the proof of our religion. That they are of momentous importance to it would seem evident from the place which they fill in the sacred volume. Prophecy occupies a larger space there than miracles—it should rather be said than other miracles, for prophecy itself is a miracle, and a standing miracle. But, besides the great place which the books of the prophets hold in the records of the Divine revelation, it is a very striking fact, as Paley has observed, that in the preaching of the Apostles, as recorded in the book of their Acts and in their Epistles, much less stress is laid upon the miracles wrought by our Lord than upon the fulfilment of prophecy in His life, death, and resurrection. The miracles are referred to in passing as things well known. The Jews are reminded that our Lord went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed with the devil. But the main point on which an Apostle like St. Peter lays stress is that "to Him give all the prophets witness."

This fact suggests the main argument in a series of lectures on this subject, which were referred to in a previous paper, not less instructive than those of Mr. Davison, the "Propaedeia Prophetica" of Dr. Lyall, sometime Dean of Canterbury. He says[1] that Paley has correctly observed "that the Apostles must have taken for granted that the miracles ascribed to Christ were known to all their hearers; but he does not add that the medium of proof by which they endeavoured to demonstrate that those miracles had God for their author was altogether drawn from the prophecies of the Old Testament" (p. 157). "The invariable purport of all their arguments, and which they kept always in view, was to prove that the Gospel which they preached was the subject of the *prophecies* with which the Jewish Scriptures were filled, and, so far as appears, it was only this which the Jews denied." He adds that "the early fathers of the Church do not found the controversy upon the miracles of Christ any more than do the

[1] The references are to the edition of the "Propaedeia Prophetica," published in 1885 by the Rev. G. C. Pearson, M.A., Honorary Canon of Canterbury.

writers of the New Testament. Both of them take these wonderful *facts* for granted, but, for the *explanation* of them, recourse is had only to the Old Testament" (p. 158). Take the leading fathers of the two or three centuries, after the death of our Lord, and he observes with truth that, "while all of them, either directly or by implication, attribute their own conversion to the study of the Old Testament, not one—if we except Arnobius—appeals to the miracles as a proof of Christ's Divine authority" (p. 159). In short, the early apologists of Christianity, though alluding to the miracles of Christ as substantiating their belief, yet vindicate their belief itself, not on this ground, but on the fulfilment of the Hebrew prophecies. It was not, in other words, only the performance by our Lord of wonderful works, but the correspondence of those works, and the claims by which they were accompanied, with the continuous series of prophecies throughout the course of Jewish history, which conclusively evidenced their Divine character and authority.

In illustration of this view of the importance of prophecy, it may be observed, in the first instance, that the simplest prophecies, if fulfilled, afford an unquestionable revelation more direct and more intelligible than any other miracles. Abraham, for instance, according to the Book of Genesis, received the promise that a son should be born to himself and Sarah beyond the ordinary course of nature, and this promise was fulfilled. But its fulfilment at once afforded Abraham an assurance that he was in communion with a supernatural Being. Who that Being was, what was His character and will, he would learn by other communications, but the one fulfilled prophecy assured him that a Being had spoken to him in whose hands were the springs of his life, who compassed his path and his lying down, and who was acquainted with all his ways. The birth of Isaac, however marvellous or miraculous, if occurring without any explanation and standing by itself, would simply have told him that he was in contact with some mysterious force beyond the range of ordinary experience; but it would not of itself have revealed to him either the nature of the force or the character of his relation to it. But when it occurred in accordance with the promise which had been made to him, it at once revealed to him the fact that his life and his destiny were subject to the knowledge and control of the Being by whom that promise was made. As a general rule, in fact, it is not the miracle by itself, but the miracle combined with the command, or the prediction, that it should occur, which constitutes the revelation. In the two combined we witness, not merely a supernatural manifestation, but the manifestation of a supernatural

and intelligent will, and it is this which constitutes the essence of a religious revelation.

It was, we may observe, a mode of revelation which was peculiarly appropriate, and even necessary, to the foundation of religious life and faith in the world. It is possible in the present day, from our intimate acquaintance with Nature, for very powerful arguments to be constructed on a basis of purely natural theology to convince us that the world was made, and is sustained, by a Being of supreme wisdom and goodness. But in the early days of the religious history of mankind such arguments were scarcely possible; and the statement in the Epistle to the Hebrews was peculiarly true, that by faith it was believed that the worlds were framed by the word of God. But nothing could contribute more to produce that faith than that men should have tangible evidence that the course of their own lives and the destinies of their nation were foreknown to, and directed by, a living Being who, in all His communications to them, spoke as the God of all righteousness as well as of all knowledge. A child in a distant country may never have seen its father; but if it receives letters from him from time to time, directing it what to do and telling it what provision will be made for it, and if the promises thus held out to it are fulfilled, it can have no doubt of its being under its father's guidance and control. The case of the Jews, from Abraham downwards, is closely parallel. They were under the Divine education, and they received communications from time to time telling them what was the destiny immediately intended for them, and imposing certain duties on them; and when they found those destinies realized—when, according to the promise, they were brought into Egypt; when, according to the promise, they were brought out of Egypt; when, according to the promise, they were settled in Canaan; when the course of their history there was accompanied by successive predictions, which were successively fulfilled—there could be no doubt to the thoughtful Jews, and there can be no reasonable doubt to ourselves if we believe these facts, that a living God was among them, governing and directing them. It was, above all things, the prophecy that revealed Him. It was this which revealed the design, the will, the wisdom, and the righteousness which were at work among them, and assured them that they were not in contact with blind forces, or with unknown gods, but with the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

It may be worth considering whether this does not afford, in great measure, an explanation of one of the most striking circumstances in the history of the Jews—the alteration in their religious character after the exile. Until the time of the

exile they had been perpetually falling back into idolatry, but when they returned from the exile every trace of this tendency seems to have disappeared. They have become a nation of unbending believers in one God, the God of their fathers; and their danger lies no longer in a temptation to worship other gods, or to be false to their law, but in a contrary tendency to exalt their belief and their obedience to the law into a new idolatry. Is it unnatural to suppose that the exile had been to them, as the fulfilment of prophecy, the final proof that the God of whom their prophets had spoken to them was the one living God, and that their whole welfare depended, as had always been proclaimed to them, on obedience to His will and His law? The predictions of the exile, first of Israel and then of Judah, were the culminating prophecies in respect to ancient Jewish history; and their fulfilment, in all the bitterness of the terrible reality, was at least well fitted to set the seal upon all previous prophecies, and to stamp upon the mind of the Jew those truths respecting the nature and the will of the God of his fathers which a less severe discipline had been insufficient to teach him. At every turn of Jewish history the prophetic voice is heard bespeaking the loving guidance and will of God. Those voices, together with their fulfilment, afford the revelation of a living being as distinctly and unmistakably as any distant person not seen by ourselves—to take our Lord's image, as a king in a far country—is revealed by his commands and promises when we see them acted up to and fulfilled. To the Jews after the exile, to the Jews of our Lord's day, this revelation was complete; and nothing was so certain to them as that, at sundry times and in divers manners, God had spoken unto their fathers by the prophets, and that they owed to Him and to His law their absolute allegiance and obedience.

Now, these considerations will further explain the reason why, as we have seen, the arguments of the Apostles are so predominantly concerned with the evidence of prophecy. It was their mission to proclaim a new dispensation, which would, in great measure, supersede the old. The truth was realized more and more by themselves and by others that, in accordance with the charge against Stephen, Jesus of Nazareth would change the customs which Moses, and God through Moses, had delivered to the Jews. Now, it may be admitted that it would have been possible for some stupendous manifestation to have authenticated beyond all doubt this assertion of the close and supersession of a Divine dispensation. It might even be argued that the miracles, the moral authority, and the resurrection of our Lord, did constitute such a manifestation, and were of themselves sufficient warrant for the

abrogation of the Mosaic ordinances. That, indeed, would be a stronger argument to the Gentile than to the Jew, whose whole soul was steeped in the belief of the Divine character of those ordinances. But, at all events, it will be seen that it adds enormously to the force of the works and words of our Lord if it can be shown that those works and words, and the revolution of religious practice which He and His Apostles proclaimed, were themselves not only not contrary to the old law and to the existing dispensation, but actually in harmony with them, and predicted by them as much and as distinctly as the previous revolutions in Jewish history from first to last. If this were so, then, though the Gospel might change the customs which God through Moses had delivered to the Jews, it was not the subversion of them, but the fulfilment of them. It put the coping-stone upon the great temple of Divine revelation, and revealed a perfect harmony from first to last in the Divine will and government. The Jew, after all, was right in demanding some momentous evidence before he consented to the supersession of the law, of which the Divine origin and authority had been stamped upon his mind by so terrible an experience; and it was at least a most merciful, if not a necessary, dispensation that that evidence should be afforded by the very prophecies to which he clung. If those prophecies and that law themselves predicted the Gospel, and foretold the life, the death, and the resurrection of the Saviour, with the spiritual dominion which He was to establish, then the Divine character of the new dispensation was one with that of the old, the purposes and the will of God were unchanged, and the preaching of the Apostles was authenticated by the very Divine oracles to which the Jews appealed.

To quote the striking illustration of Dean Lyall (pp. 171-173), the case may be compared to that of an ambassador who comes from a king in a far country bringing a communication to his subjects, which seems at first of so perplexing and unwelcome a character that they are inclined to doubt his credentials. But suppose, to quote an expression both of Isaiah and Daniel, a sealed document was in the possession of the people, which was not to be opened until such an ambassador arrived, and suppose that on its being opened and read it was found to substantiate the ambassador's credentials, no doubt of his authority would then remain. Prophecy was in the position of that sealed document—or perhaps, we may say, of a document in cipher—which could not be understood until the key was supplied. It at once afforded the Apostles an adequate guarantee that, as the ambassadors of Christ, they were also the ambassadors of the God of their fathers and of the prophets; and that the God of

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had sent *them*, no less than He had sent Moses formerly, with a commission from Himself.

In a word, prophecy, if not the only possible proof, is at least the best and most effective proof that the Christian revelation comes from that one living God who has manifested Himself to us by a continuous series of revelations from the early patriarchal ages down to the time of our Lord and of His Apostles. These things were told us before they came to pass, that when they did come to pass we might believe. Let me further point out that even if, as some writers, like Paley, seem to have thought, the evidence of prophecy be in some respects of less crucial importance to ourselves than it was to the Jews of our Lord's day or to those who lived in the infancy of revelation, yet it still affords a testimony to the primary and cardinal truths of revelation which is of supreme value. What is there for which men ask more anxiously at the present day than for evidence of the presence, and of the action in the course of life, of a living and personal God? Some philosophers and men of science would relegate us to the bare acknowledgment of some supreme but unknown energy from which all things have ultimately proceeded; but they allege that there is no proof of its direct interposition and control in the course of the world of nature, still less in that of life and history. We are tempted, under the influence of this philosophy, to acknowledge a God as a hypothesis, an ultimate law, but to lose the apprehension that He is the Lord our God, and that we are the people of His pasture and the sheep of His hand. But if the facts of prophecy are true, they afford us the most direct and positive evidence of this cardinal truth. We hear in them the voice of a Being who has beset us behind and before and laid His hand upon us; who has declared beforehand, in all the great crises of the central history of our race, the end to which that history was tending, and the purpose by which it was governed. You listen to the declaration, before the event, of a deliberate and a righteous design in the history of the world, pointing forward from patriarchal ages to the Christian dispensation under which we now live. There has been much dispute whether the mere fact of the adaptation of the parts of a structure to one end constitutes an adequate proof of its being the product of deliberate design; but if you add to such an adaptation the fact that the end was announced at the very commencement of the adaptation, and that each advance in the growth or development of the structure was similarly announced, and the explanation of its purpose given beforehand, there can then surely remain no reasonable doubt that the structure is the work of deliberate wisdom, and that we

are in communion with the mind and will of the designer. The voice of such prophecy as that of the Scriptures is the unmistakable voice of the living Being, by whom the life and the history which it predicts are controlled, and it forces us to recognise, not merely the existence of God, but His living presence and action. Let me only add that it gives us an invaluable assurance that we ourselves in our daily lives are similarly in the presence and under the guidance of that living God. It affords us a sure and solid ground for our faith in the conviction of the Psalmist: "Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being imperfect, and in Thy book were all my members written, which day by day were fashioned when as yet there was none of them." It must enable us to exclaim with him: "Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit, or whither shall I flee from Thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, Thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me."

HENRY WACE.

ART. VI.—WHAT ENGLAND MAY LEARN FROM ITALY.

WHEN in 1870 the Italian nation entered into possession of its capital, the King's Government knew well that it had before it a most difficult task to adjust the relations between the Papacy and the kingdom. In 1866 an opportunity had been given to Italy to cut the links which bound the Church to the Pope, and to establish an independent National Church under its own Archbishops and Bishops, independent of the Papacy and loyal to the State. At that moment the mind of the Italian people was intensely irritated against Pius IX., who had led them forward on the path of political reform, until he found that it was leading to the aggrandizement, not of the Pope as the President of a Federal Italy, but of the King of Piedmont as the monarch of the Peninsula, when he turned round upon his steps, and throwing himself into the arms of the Jesuits, desired Catholics to burn what he had ordered them politically to worship, and to worship what he had ordered them to burn. And this was not the only cause of irritation. While Pius IX. was driven into exile and only restored by French arms, which afterwards supported him, the young kingdom of Italy had been constituting itself, with Florence for its provisional capital. And so keen an antagonism had sprung up between that new kingdom and the

Papacy that no less than thirty-four bishoprics in the Peninsula were vacant, the Pope refusing to consecrate the nominees of the Crown. All seemed progressing towards the establishment of a National Church. The crisis came in 1866: Cavour was dead, Baron Ricasoli was Prime Minister, and he had to decide between the policy of defiance and of reconciliation. His personal feeling was one of strong hostility to the Papacy; but he did not feel himself justified in acting on personal feeling. He was answerable for the safety of the new kingdom, which had hardly yet established itself in the eyes of Europe. He did not dare to array against the Italian kingdom a hatred more bitter than was already entertained by the ultramontane sentiment of Europe and the Roman Curia. He resolved on a policy of reconciliation. That meant giving up to the vengeance of the Pope, and the Bishops newly appointed by the Pope, presbyters who had aimed at reform in Italy; and it meant a policy on the part of the State of washing its hands of all religion in accordance with a mistaken understanding of Cavour's famous saying, "a free Church in a free State." Accordingly, the nomination to the vacant sees was given up to the Pope; the oaths of vassalage which bind Roman Catholic Bishops to the Pope, and the fetters which fasten the lower clergy to the Bishops, were drawn tighter instead of being relaxed; the priests who, relying on the King's protection, had been loyal and patriotic, were given up defenceless to the vengeance of their superiors, and a dull state-craft played the game of the Papacy in the name and under the disguise of Liberalism. Ricasoli's reconciliation policy crushed the reformation movement in Italy for a generation. The vacant sees were filled by men who gloried in being the willing instruments of the Roman Curia, and they made it their first work to stifle the spirit of reform which had been strong enough and venturesome enough to make the Vatican tremble. They succeeded. At Naples alone 300 priests, hitherto under the jurisdiction of the King's chaplain, were compelled by Archbishop Riario Sforza to choose between unconditional surrender or starvation. In every corner of Italy the Church reformers were hunted down and silenced. Finding themselves helpless, they returned to the old system, according to which they might believe what they liked, and live as they liked, provided they said and did nothing to the detriment of the authority of the Curia. Priests became more than ever the slaves of the Bishops, and the Bishops were more than ever the slaves of the Pope, and laymen went their way, disregarding both.

When, in 1870, the Italians entered Rome and made it the capital of the kingdom, the same policy of abstention in

religious matters was adopted. Conversing with Signor Minghetti, the Italian Prime Minister, in 1871, I asked him if something could not be done to give Italy a more loyal body of Bishops. "No," he said, "that would be impossible, because all interference on the part of the State with spiritual or ecclesiastical matters should, we think, be done away with."

The same idea pervades a discussion which I held with Signor Tommasi, a professor at the Roman University, in the same year. Like most other Italian Liberals, he thought that no help could be given to the National party within the Church by the State, though he allowed that the co-existence of the scepticism of the educated and the ultramontanism of the Jesuitical party was the great danger of Italy as a nation. "Does the liberty of the Church," I asked, "mean liberty on the part of the Pope to nominate to bishoprics men notorious for their hostility to the present settlement? and does it mean liberty on the part of the Bishops to suspend at their pleasure and otherwise tyrannize over all priests who do not absolutely submit to their commands?" "Parliament cannot interfere in these things," he said. "We have once for all granted liberty, and we leave the Church to settle its own internal affairs." "An excellent principle," I replied, "and one with which I have hearty sympathy; but are not the circumstances of the Italian Church such as not to make it fairly applicable at the present moment? An Englishman would inquire what would be the results." "The results," he said, "are evil" (and the condemnation of a priest for offering spiritual consolation to some of the King's soldiers, which occurred at this very moment, added force to his remark), "but how are we to obviate them and yet preserve our principle of washing our hands of all religion?" "Is not," I said, "the Papal system different from that of all other Churches and religions? Is it not practically, in one of its aspects, a temporal power, under an absolute despot? and does not this temporal power require to be confronted by the more legitimate temporal authority of the civil power?" "Liberal politicians are not prepared again to entangle themselves in religious matters," he returned. "But there are at least two great encouragements," he continued. "Free principles are undoubtedly rooting themselves in Italy, and the kingdom of Italy has won the prestige belonging to the occupation of Rome. What is now wanting is a movement by a leading ecclesiastic." "And what protection would he and his followers have from the State if they were deprived of their benefices and salaries by the Pope?" "None." "Then they would be starved?" "Unless they could find support for themselves." "Under these circumstances, it is not wonderful that there is no Döllinger and no Hyacinthe of Italy."

Here, then, was a principle resolutely and firmly adopted by the State when it established itself in Rome on the ruins of the Papal monarchy. "We have accepted the Pope and the Papal system," said Italian statesmen, "whether for good or for evil, and our intention is to give full power to the Pope and the Papal authorities to conduct their Church as a religious system in any way that they please."

Since the entrance of the Italians into Rome a quarter of a century has passed, and in that time the successive Italian Governments have found that, in spite of the abolition of the temporal power—or perhaps, indeed, all the more for that reason—the Roman Catholic Church in Italy has shown itself not merely a religious but a political institution, thwarting the interests of the State wherever opportunity offered. Dr. Robertson, who has written a most instructive book, called "The Roman Catholic Church in Italy," full of the animus of a man who has lived long in Italy and shares the feelings of lay Italians, points out that the Italian Government, having recognised this fact, have met the aggressions or intrigues of the Roman Catholic Church with measures calculated to frustrate its mischievous efforts, or to prevent the evils naturally resulting from those efforts. He instances, in two cases, education and monasteries, and he goes on to inquire how, in like circumstances, the British Government has acted in Ireland and elsewhere. We may, with him, ask whether there are not lessons which England may learn from Italy.

Unlike all other religious systems, Roman Catholicism, according to Dr. Robertson, where it ceases to be a political power becomes a political conspiracy. This was the case, he maintains, in England, as shown by the history of the times of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. But he continues: "It is in Italy, with its capital still, unhappily, the seat and shrine of the Pope, that the character of the Roman Catholic Church as a political conspiracy is most patent and pronounced. Here it proclaims itself unblushingly as the uncompromising enemy of the State, and it is recognised as such, and it is dealt with as such. Signor Crispi, in the *New Review* for May, 1892, wrote: "To be a sincere Catholic and a friend of Italy is to the Italians a contradiction." The King and the Pope stand face to face in Rome—the King holding the title and exercising the rights of the Sovereign of Italy, the Pope denying the King's claims and arrogating a sovereignty to himself; the King representing the Italian State, the Pope, Cardinals, Canons and priests intriguing against its unity and independence and all that makes for its prosperity and happiness. We have seen a similar state of things in the history of England. In Elizabeth's reign Gregory XIII. sent an invading army to Ireland,

under the command of Thomas Stukeley, whom he dared, by his own authority, to create Baron of Ross, Viscount Morough, Earl of Wexford, and Marquis of Leinster; and he ordered the entire clergy, nobility, and people of the kingdom of Ireland to support Fitzmaurice's rebellion, and "not be afraid of a woman (Elizabeth), who, having been long ago bound with the chain of anathema, and still increasing in her filthiness, has departed from the Lord, and the Lord has departed from her; and"—an unfulfilled Papal prophecy—"many calamities shall overtake her, according to her deserts." Elizabeth's statesmen knew how to meet force by force, and Italian statesmen have, according to Dr. Robertson, boldly confronted the hostility with which they are threatened by Papal intrigue and, he enquires, Are English statesmen of the twentieth century stamping out or succumbing to Papal disloyalty in Ireland?

"The Government of Italy, whilst allowing the Church great liberty, has at last had to pass laws which shut (Roman Catholic) priests out of all civil spheres, and which check them in all attempts to terrorize the people with their spiritual arms. The (Roman Catholic) Church in Italy has had to be tied down by penal statutes, Disabilities Acts, such as England with foolish magnanimity has erased from its statute books" (p. 141).

All of us who have read Mr. McCarthy's "Priests and People of Ireland"—and we ought all to read it if we have not already done so—will have been astonished to see the enormous sums of public money which, under one heading or another, are placed in the hands of the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops and priests for the education of the young in hatred of England. Dr. Robertson tells us that Italian statesmen, finding that schools under the direction of Roman Catholic priests "were turning out scholars ignorant of everything useful, and with hatred to their country rankling in their breasts, exactly as they do to-day in the Government schools of Ireland," banished Roman Catholic priests from all the public schools. Finding that professors of universities were corrupting the students by teaching the theology of Alfonso de' Liguori, they dismissed them and abolished their chairs. Finding that chaplains in the army and navy were tampering with the loyalty of soldiers and sailors, they removed them. Finding, further, that the Roman Catholic priests were seeking to influence and control elections by the exercise of spiritual terrorism, as they are freely permitted to do in Ireland, and were persecuting any who sent their children to Protestant schools, they passed, in 1890, a New Penal Code, making ministers who abused their powers to the injury of the institu-

tions of the State, or who damaged private interests and disturbed the peace of families, liable to immediate punishment by fine, imprisonment, or suspension. The effect of this law has been to prevent what notoriously goes on without hindrance in Ireland. For example, the priest at Brescia threatened to withhold the privileges of the Church from any who should vote for the present Prime Minister, Signor Zanardelli, and on repeating the offence, after warning given, he was fined £20, imprisoned for two months, and suspended for five years. In like manner, if a father complains that a priest has threatened him or any of his family for sending his children to Protestant schools, the priest becomes liable to penalties if he does not immediately desist. The same Act put a stop to another crying evil.

"I knew a case of a peasant in a Riviera village being induced by a priest to leave his money to the Church. His sons returned from America and took the priest to court; the will was set aside, they received the whole inheritance, and the priest was sent into penal servitude. I cannot help mentioning in this connection an almost analogous case which happened in Ireland, with, however, very different results. On the death of their father two sons returned from abroad. They found that a priest had, when visiting their dying parent, taken a lawyer with him, who then and there drew out a will in favour of the Church, setting aside one already existing in their favour. They took the priest to court, but lost their case; they then appealed against the decision, but lost again, and had the expenses of both trials to pay" (p. 145).

In contrast to Italian practice as now permitted, Mr. McCarthy, an Irish Roman Catholic layman, complains in the book above mentioned that the energies of the priests in Ireland are directed to "terrifying the enfeebled minds of the credulous, the invalid, and the aged, with the result that the savings of penurious thrift, the inheritance of parental industry, the competence of respectability, are all alike captured in their turn from expectant next-of-kin, and garnered into the sacerdotal treasury."

Having pointed out that it is by law that Italy holds in check "a gigantic ecclesiastical conspiracy," Dr. Robertson says that she reads England a lesson; "for England obstinately and foolishly shutting her eyes to the political aspect of the Papal Church, and persisting in regarding it only from the standpoint of religion, allows her own subjects to be terrorized, robbed, and persecuted. This takes place every day in Ireland, and instances of it are becoming much too frequent in great centres of Christian work, such as in London and in Liverpool" (p. 148).

We need hardly say that no Italian statesman conceived or entertained such an idea as that of using the taxes of the people for establishing a university "with a Catholic atmosphere," where history might be perverted, and disloyalty and hatred of the governing power might be freely inculcated, at the will of the Roman Catholic episcopate, on Protestant and Roman Catholic students alike.

We turn to Dr. Robertson's other instance, monasticism. Since the abolition of monasticism in the sixteenth century England has seen so little of monks and nuns that we have hardly believed in their existence, or regarded them only as a curious relic of antiquity. The reason of this is given in Mr. McCabe's "Life in a Modern Monastery," p. 196. As a matter of diplomacy, he says that the friars laid aside their conspicuous costume; and this has been done by all the Orders and congregations in England. "They wear their distinctive habit in their houses and churches, but do not venture abroad in it. Thus the average Briton is wholly unsuspicious of the number of monks and monasteries that have grown up around him during the last half-century. In London alone there are five Franciscan friaries, containing some fifty brethren; there are altogether some two hundred or three hundred religious of various orders." In Ireland monks and nuns are more to the front, and what Roman Catholic laymen think of them may be seen in Mr. McCarthy's "Priests and People of Ireland." But English statesmen have not awakened to the peril or injury that they may be to the country. In 1866, Piedmont set the example to Italy of suppressing all monastic houses in her territory. Baron Ricasoli extended the Piedmontese law to the rest of Italy. With the exception of a few houses, "all religious Orders were declared to be at an end, the creation of new monks and nuns to be illegal, and all monastic buildings to be national property." These institutions have not been prohibited on the ground of their being religious societies, but because they have been proved to be detrimental to the interests of the State and to public morality. It may be asked, Are such institutions a peril to Great Britain at the present moment? That depends upon their number and the power that they exert in the British Isles. There are some drugs that are conducive to health so long as they are taken in small quantities, but as soon as they exceed the proportion which they ought to hold with reference to other elements, they cause death. In like manner monastic institutions, Jesuit societies, and, in general, Papal influences, may be absorbed by the body politic, and cause no harm so long as they stand in such proportion to other organizations and institutions that their effect is reduced practically to nothing,

but let them make themselves felt, and become a power in the State, and the ruin of the country is assured. The numbers of monks and nuns who are at the present time passing over from France to England is enough to cause grave apprehension. Certainly, if our eyes were opened, we should not encourage nunneries by specially exempting from inspection the sewing and washing institutions which they direct, in spite of the terrible revelations which have been made in France of the cruelty, surpassing that of any sweating houses, with which nuns have treated those whom they have employed and by whose labour the nunneries have been made rich.

Dr. Robertson ends his book by again impressing on Englishmen the "object lesson" which he has offered to them. After reading the books of Mr. McCarthy and Mr. O'Donnell on education in Ireland, he asks whether England is not "false to herself, and false to the trust imposed upon her by God," in leaving the education of her subjects in the hands of the Roman Catholic priests. Italy, he says, has banished Roman Catholic priests and nuns as teachers from all the public schools, and does not allow Roman Catholic priests to be professors in the universities, the reason of this being, not that they teach religion, but that they teach a religion that is incompatible with the welfare of the State. That we have arrived at a point where it is necessary to adopt such drastic measures as those urged by Dr. Robertson[1] we are not prepared to say. But at least we may resolve that no further public moneys shall be poured into the laps of the Roman Catholic Bishops and priests in Ireland for the purpose of creating institutions "with a Catholic atmosphere," where, as Mr. Dillon has said, "the soul of Ireland" (as figured by himself) "may freely" (except for Papal fetters) "move and make itself heard."

F. MEYRICK.

---

[1] Page 270. The title of Dr. Robertson's book is "The Roman Catholic Church in Italy" (Morgan and Scott, London).

ART. VII.—"LIFE AND LETTERS OF BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D."[1]

I.

THESE volumes are a worthy record of a life of far-reaching influence and power. But they are more than this: they contain, in private letters written to intimate friends, a rich legacy of precious thoughts and judgments from one who had qualified himself to be regarded among his contemporaries as pre-eminently a Christian philosopher.

Many will remember the regrets uttered by scholars when it became known that Professor Westcott had accepted the Bishopric of Durham. There would be no more valuable commentaries upon the various books of the New Testament, and no more essays like that upon "Origen and the Beginnings of Christian Philosophy." But this "Life" convinces us that, if from one point of view his elevation to the episcopate was a loss, from another point of view it was a decided gain. It made the thinker into a speaker. So to speak, it *forced* him into the pulpit and on to the platform, and it compelled him to give his message, not only to the student in the lecture-room, but to the Church and to the nation. As we think over the contents of "Christian Aspects of Life," "Lessons from Work," and "Words of Faith and Hope," we cannot help wondering, had the same necessity—that which comes from filling a high position of public responsibility—been laid upon Dr. Hort, how much might have been given us which, alas! was—possibly through the very lack of this *necessity* of utterance—withheld.

Perhaps the most remarkable feature in Dr. Westcott's character was the combination of strenuousness and many-sidedness. The two qualities are rarely in such a degree found together as they existed in him. He was a first-rate scholar, theologian, and philosopher. He showed literary power of a very high order. His knowledge of mathematics and natural science was sufficient to make him a capable teacher in both subjects; besides, he was a cultivated musician, and an artist of whose capability the drawings scattered through these volumes are quite sufficient evidence. Yet in no one of these branches of knowledge was he the merely interested amateur; on the contrary, whatever subject he took up, he seemed in it to become a master. And where else shall we find an example of one who to the age of sixty-

[1] "Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D., D.C.L., sometime Bishop of Durham." By his son, Arthur Westcott. Two volumes. London: Macmillan and Co., 1903.

five had lived the life of the deep thinker, of shy and retiring habits, and who at that age becomes the able administrator, and develops the power of holding the attention of uncultured audiences on such subjects as the problems of trade-unionism, the rate of wages, co-operation, and other topics dear to the hearts of industrial democracy?

The many-sidedness of Bishop Westcott's life is beyond question; of the *strenuousness* of his life these two volumes form one long chain of evidence. If possible, his life was too strenuous. He seemed almost incapable of relaxation. A holiday was neither looked forward to nor enjoyed, except as an opportunity of doing work of a more permanent nature than could be done amid the daily discharge of the duties of his profession.

This quality of strenuousness was as evident in boyhood as in later life. In his school-days, under Lee at Birmingham, the hours which other boys spent in play "he devoted to voluntary classical work or to studying history and archæology." On his very occasional holidays he would walk from forty to fifty miles in the day, not for the sake of exercise, but "to study old castles and churches, or to search for plants and fossils." In the interesting account of Dr. Westcott's school-days (contributed by his brother-in-law), we read: "Earnestly and thoroughly, I may say intensely, he threw himself into every work. . . . I never knew him indulge in mere pastimes or loitering indolence of any kind. Unflagging in effort and thoughtful occupation, he even then had little time to play."

His life at Cambridge as an undergraduate was just as strenuous as it had been at school. He was accustomed to rise at 5 a.m., and, with short intervals for chapel and breakfast, to work until 2 p.m. From then until dinner, which was at 4 p.m., he walked. Chapel was again attended at 6 p.m., after which he usually read till midnight.

It is always interesting to trace the intellectual and spiritual growth of a great life, and especially during the "formative" years—say between eighteen and twenty-five—the period during which growth is generally most rapid, and when the particular "bent" or direction of life is usually taken or becomes fixed. For studying these years in Dr. Westcott's case there exist two series of documents of great interest and value, one being a long series of letters to his future wife—to whom he became engaged in his teens—the other being a diary which he kept while an undergraduate, and in which he used to note, not only events which occurred, but his own intimate thoughts, impressions, and judgments.

Still, we have to confess that, though the extracts from both

these sources are extremely full, the "curve" or "spiral" of Dr. Westcott's spiritual development is not easy to trace; and this is even more the case when we attempt to trace the development of his ecclesiastical ideas. Even at the cost of adding a few pages to the first volume, we think it might have been useful—at any rate, for the present generation—if the writer of the "Life" had given a brief sketch of the spiritual and ecclesiastical "atmospheres" of Cambridge—or of the want of these—during the early years of Westcott's residence there. This, we think, might have helped to explain the apparent absence of any influence upon him of any of the Cambridge clergymen and teachers, with, perhaps, the single exceptions of Harvey Goodwin (later Bishop of Carlisle) and, though in a less degree, of Professor J. J. Blunt.

Of the intensity of Westcott's own personal religion there are ample proofs—*e.g.*, the following extract from a letter to his father, written upon his election to the first University scholarship which he won: "If there is one thing in this examination I look on at all with pleasure, it is that I believe I did not go into a paper without first praying that I might consider it entirely in God's hands; that, however the result might be (not that I had any idea of getting the scholarship, but I hoped to do well), I might view it entirely as His will and the best that could happen" (vol. i., p. 39). But some of his judgments and opinions during this period, when compared with his views in later years, seem curious. To say that Westcott was ever "under the spell" of the Oxford Movement would probably be untrue, for of Hampden he writes: "I thought myself that he was grievously in error; but yesterday I read over the selections from his writings which his adversaries make, and in them I found systematically expressed the very strains of thought which I have been endeavouring to trace out for the last two or three years. If he be condemned, what will become of me? I believe he holds the truth" (p. 94). Yet, at the same time, to assert that the Oxford Movement had no influence upon him would, I think, be false. No book about this time is more frequently referred to by him than "The Christian Year," of which he writes: "I owe more to that book almost than any other." Again, within two pages (44, 45) occur the following extracts from his diary: (1) "Is there not that in the principles of the Evangelical School which must lead to the exaltation of the individual minister? and does not that help to prove their unsoundness? If preaching is the chief means of grace, it must emanate, not from the Church, but from the preacher; and besides placing him in a false position, it places him in a fearfully dangerous one." (2) "The question of Apostolical

Succession comes strikingly before me to-day. Never did the general truth of the doctrine appear so clear."

But there was another factor in Westcott's development during these years which must not be forgotten, and which, we believe, left its influence—especially in his sympathy with those who were undergoing a like experience—upon the whole of his after-life. He passed through a period of doubt, but as to the exact nature of his difficulties neither his diary nor his letters belonging to the time are quite clear. In a summary of the year 1846 he writes: "I trust that my earnestness for higher objects has not grown colder. My faith still is wavering. I cannot determine how much we *must* believe; how much, in fact, is necessarily required of a member of the Church" (p. 46). Again, six months later, he writes: "I have never experienced more pleasure than in reading Butler again. I trust he has entirely dissipated my chief doubts. The few which still remain may be removed by greater earnestness and prayerfulness, I trust" (p. 51). And once more: "How many are the difficulties I experience no one can tell. At least, I trust I am teachable, and do sincerely desire to find the truth; but I cannot acquiesce in that which I *hope* is true without I am also *convinced*. . . . It is no unwillingness to believe makes me speak thus . . . but a sense of duty to inquire into the grounds of my faith" (p. 57). And yet again two years later he writes: "I suppose many feel as I do, and yet I dare look nowhere for sympathy. I cannot describe the feeling with which I regard the hundreds I see around me, who conform without an apparent struggle, who seem ever cheerful, ever faithful and believing. It is not joy and satisfaction, as it should be; it is not envy; but it is a kind of awe and doubt—a mixture of wonder and suspicion. May it soon be of hearty and sincere sympathy!" (p. 111).

The spirit which these confessions breathe is prophetic of the result of the struggle—that is, a sure and certain victory for faith, and that a faith which was not "accepted," in the usual sense in which the word is employed, but a faith won and enjoyed as the issue of deep thought and patient study. How much does all this explain in his future teaching—*e.g.*, in "The Gospel of the Resurrection" and in "The Gospel of Life"!

After taking his degree, Westcott remained at Cambridge for three years, taking private pupils, among these being Lightfoot, Hort, and E. W. Benson. It was during these years that his first book—the Hulsean Prize Essay for 1850—was written. Originally published as "The Elements of the Gospel Harmony," the volume was in the second and

subsequent editions much enlarged, and its title was changed into "An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels." Commenting on the early age at which this, now a standard theological work, was written, the writer of Bishop Westcott's obituary notice in the *Times* (July 29, 1901) remarked: "Men do not to-day stop to think what an extraordinary *tour de force* this book represents as coming from a young man of five-and-twenty. From the Fathers to the Germans, such as Sonntag and Hagenbach, Westcott had covered the whole field of theological literature, and he could bring to the discussion thoughts of almost Apostolic depth and insight."

In the year 1851 Westcott was ordained both deacon and priest by his old master, now Bishop of Manchester. "But," as his son writes, "he was never able to look back with any pleasure on the circumstances of his ordination. He was greatly disappointed at the lack of fatherly sympathy for which he had hoped, and grieved at the generally undevotional character of the proceedings."

That Westcott's doubts had by this time ceased to trouble him, the following extract from a letter to his future wife seems to be proof: "It is never possible to be too secure or too clear in our views. There is a far closer connection between reason and faith than most persons are ready to acknowledge. To believe firmly we must know distinctly; many of the objects of our faith may be mysteries, but we must at least know they are such, and we must feel their immensity. This disconnection of knowledge and faith, so common in our age, is to be paralleled by the common excuse given for different men, 'that they act according to their conscience,' as if conscience was as definite a power as one of our senses, and not to be trained and enlightened according to the means vouchsafed to us; as if a man were not as much answerable for his conscience as for his actions" (p. 139).

At the end of 1851 Westcott left Cambridge. "He had fully determined," says his son, "to enter on other fields of educational work where a wife could help him," and so in January, 1852, he undertook temporary work at Harrow under Dr. Vaughan. But the temporary work became so far permanent that, as an assistant-master, he remained at Harrow until 1869. The same year that he went to Harrow he married Miss Whithard, to whom he had been so long engaged. His "views of life" at this time are contained in the following extract from a letter to her in reference to their future life and work together: "To live is not to be gay or idle or restless. Frivolity, inactivity, and aimlessness seem equally remote from the true idea of living. I should say that we live only so far as we cultivate all our faculties and

improve all our advantages for God's glory. The means of living then will be our own endowments, whether of talent or influence; the aim of living, the good of men; the motive of living, the love of God. . . . Every pleasure that rests on any other basis must be unsatisfactory; every pain that is supported by any other prop, overwhelming. We must, then, look forward. We must value our earthly blessings as pilgrims would a fair scene. We must take comfort and refreshment from them, and then press more vigorously onwards. But still more, 'no man liveth to himself.' We should remember the incalculable effects of the most trifling actions. The fate of thousands will depend on you and me. . . . We must remember that we are beacons 'set on an hill,' which, if they give an uncertain light, will bring ruin on countless multitudes of harbourless mariners. . . . Let us remember that we do not injure ourselves alone by neglecting a duty but many a being, who but for our carelessness might have shared in endless happiness, that by our zeal we awaken others from their indifference, and are allowed to minister to the good of thousands" (pp. 145, 146).

The eighteen years which Westcott spent at Harrow were a very important epoch in his life; perhaps not so much on account of the direct teaching work which he did there, as for the immense amount of work he accomplished in his "leisure" time. Of his success as a schoolmaster it would be difficult to speak with certainty, the truth probably being that, while his influence on the school as a whole was not great, his influence on a comparatively few thoughtful and studious boys, who came under his immediate care and instruction, was extremely powerful. When we consider the amount and the quality of the extra work he accomplished during these years, and that for this he never neglected, but, on the contrary, was "constantly discharging to the uttermost, his regular school duties," and was "during the long years of his Harrow life heart and soul a Harrow master," we can well understand, as his son tells us, that "his industry and his capacity for work were extraordinary." To this period belong many of his most important writings—*e.g.*, "The Canon of the New Testament" (1855), a large number of long articles in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible" (1860-1863), "The Bible in the Church" (1864), "The Gospel of the Resurrection" (1866), many of the essays in "The History of Religious Thought in the West" (1866-1867), and "The History of the English Bible" (1868).

Some of the testimonies to Westcott's work and influence during this period are very striking—*e.g.*, those from Mr. C. B. Heberden, Bishop Gore, and Sir Charles Dalrymple. And

among the letters belonging to the Harrow years, readers of the "Life" will find some very valuable thoughts, of which the following are examples:

1. "This fact [of the Resurrection as a miracle], unless I am mistaken, is the very centre of the Apostolic teaching, and I am particularly anxious to get it placed in that light. The discussion of other miracles seems to be subordinate to that, and I do not see any objections to which the 'lesser' miracles are liable which do not lie against it; while, conversely, the relation of the Resurrection to the whole economy of Christianity seems to me to furnish the true explanation of the meaning of the other miracles" (p. 280).

2. "You will imagine that I felt the defects of 'Ecce Homo' far more than its merits. I cannot think that any estimate of our Lord's work and person which starts from its ethical aspect can be other than fatally deceptive. This was not that which the Apostles preached, and not this could have conquered the world. I feel more strongly than I dare express that it is this so-called Christian morality as 'the sum of the Gospel' which makes Christianity so powerless now" (p. 289).

3. "How marvellous that it should be left for the Comtists to rediscover some of the simplest teachings of Christianity! scarcely less marvellous than that Mr. Mill should be so profoundly and sincerely ignorant of what Christianity is, and of the religious significance of Comtism. . . . I do feel that it ought to be impossible for men to misrepresent the fundamental ideas of Christianity, and yet they do on all sides without fear of contradiction or detection" (p. 291).

4. "More and more I am convinced that the work of the Church must be done at the Universities . . . it is too late to shape men afterwards, even if they could be reached. Everything forces me into the belief that the only possible organization of a spiritual power—the paramount want of the time—is there, and that there it is possible" (p. 292).

5. "I can imagine nothing more deplorable than for a State to *become* without a religion. I should strive, then, to the uttermost to retain a Christian body bound to administer, when called upon, every Christian rite to every subject" (p. 295).

In 1869 Dr. Magee, then Bishop-designate of Peterborough, invited Westcott to become his Examining Chaplain, and at the same time offered him a stall in the cathedral. "It was surely remarkable," writes his son, "that my father's first offer of any sort of ecclesiastical preferment should have come from one who was a stranger to him, and not a member of either of the great English Universities." This offer, though it meant

a very serious loss of income, and that at a time when he could, with his growing family, ill afford it, Westcott accepted, after four days' consideration. Two years later the Bishop offered him the Archdeaconry of Northampton, but this he declined, "because he was unwilling to accept an ecclesiastical as distinct from an educational office." In the same year (1870) he was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge (his period of residence at Peterborough always began and ended in the course of the Long Vacation); five years later he was appointed an Honorary Chaplain to the Queen, and succeeded to a Chaplaincy in Ordinary in 1879.

In his work at Peterborough the many-sidedness of Westcott's nature and interests was very manifest. How various both his interests and his activities were is admirably described in the very interesting chapter entitled "A Minster Memory," contributed by Precentor Phillips, who writes: "The coming of Dr. Westcott was always welcomed as a source of fresh life by the cathedral staff. The precentor was stimulated in choosing music for the services. The organist knew that every improvement in rendering it would at once be noted. The lay-clerks and choristers felt certain of his lively interest in the singing; while each and all were assured that every effort would be appreciated, and every gift, great or small, gladly recognised by one who had always a keen eye for the merits of those around him. . . . But Dr. Westcott's efforts were by no means confined to improving and developing all that he found possible in the cathedral itself. He was ever ready and anxious to help forward every form of good work attempted in the city."

Dr. Westcott's own variety of interests, as seen in his work at Peterborough and elsewhere, was only the personal carrying out of a principle which he tried to impress upon the younger clergy. "The clergyman should cherish the widest sympathies, the most varied interests. . . . Our greatest privilege is not to suppress what belongs to sense, but to see all transfigured; not to regard time as a tedious parenthesis, but as the veil of eternity, half hiding, half revealing, what *is* for ever; not to divert the interest of men from what they have to do, but to invest every fragment of work with a potential divinity. . . . The meaning of the phrase 'spiritual power' has been unduly narrowed in these later times" (p. 360).

Dr. Westcott's connection with Peterborough, as is well known, came to an abrupt and painful end, though at the time the exact cause of his sudden resignation of his canonry and chaplaincy was known only to a few. The facts in the "Life" are stated thus: "Dr. Westcott resigned his canonry, at the request of Bishop Magee, on May 9, 1883. . . . This

most unhappy occurrence . . . was to my father himself a great surprise and shock. . . . The Bishop's contention was that my father neglected his duties as Examining Chaplain, and should, if he resigned that office, resign his canonry also" (p. 322).

Dr. Westcott's letter to the Bishop in answer to this charge, and of which it contains a complete refutation, is printed at length (pp. 322-324). The letter is much too long to give in its entirety, but, to show how completely Dr. Westcott met the Bishop's charge, the following sentences may be quoted: "I have given ungrudgingly from first to last, without the least variation, the best I have had to give. It is true that during fourteen years I have been absent from two examinations, when the Trinity Ember Week fell, as this year, in full-term time, and, in addition, from two—it may be three—days of ordination, for urgent personal reasons, which you kindly approved. On the other hand, I have, as a matter of course, and gladly, sacrificed every Christmas vacation, a time which is at my own disposal, so as to leave myself only one month in the year for rest and travel."

Within a week of the resignation of his chaplaincy to the Bishop of Peterborough Dr. Westcott accepted a similar appointment from the Archbishop of Canterbury, and a very few months later Mr. Gladstone gave him a stall in Westminster Abbey.

Readers of the "Life" will notice that chapters vi., vii., viii., and ix., entitled "Peterborough," "A Minster Memory," "Cambridge," and "Westminster," do not deal with successive periods of Dr. Westcott's life. He was, we must remember, Canon of Peterborough from 1869 to 1883, and of Westminster from 1884 to 1890, while he was Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge from 1870 to 1890; thus, the period of the professorship is almost exactly contemporaneous with those of the successive canonries.

Let us now briefly consider chapter viii. ("Cambridge"), which deals directly with Dr. Westcott's work and influence in that University. Some of us doubtless feel that as Divinity Professor Westcott may be longer and more widely remembered than even as Bishop of Durham. As Bishop his words, no doubt, reached directly a wider circle, but in Cambridge he was, if in a different way, influencing those who in a thousand various and widely-scattered spheres—in professorial chairs and University lectureships, in theological colleges and public schools, and from the pulpits of cathedral, town and country parishes—would become the channels through which his teaching and his influence would be brought to innumerable hearers.

The "spirit" in which Westcott approached his work as a Divinity Professor is indicated in the following sentences from a letter to Dr. Lightfoot: "Those who offer congratulations [on his appointment] . . . hardly feel what the work to come is. I feel to want sympathy and prayers, not congratulations" (p. 367). One of his ideals upon taking up the professorship was that the various teachers in divinity should work more in common, and in order to widen the scope of the theological faculty he tried to enlist the co-operation of Maurice, then Professor of Moral Philosophy, to whom he writes: "The thought has occurred to us that you may have selected for your subject some topic of Christian ethics. . . . Without some such application of theology to life our scheme will be very imperfect, and it will be an inestimable gain to the students preparing for Holy Orders if they can from the first be taught to feel that social morality is one side of the doctrine of the Church" (p. 369). Another of Dr. Westcott's objects was "to secure a real value for the University's divinity degrees," and "he was not afraid to disappoint entirely some who sought the D.D. degree." We must also remember that it was during the first half of his years as Professor that Dr. Westcott was engaged as a member of the New Testament Committee in the work of the Revised Version. Upon three questions which are still of current interest, we may note that Westcott was a strong supporter of the University Extension movement, that he was in favour of the retention of Greek as a compulsory subject, and also that he was strongly opposed to granting the University's degrees to women. The following are the more important works published by Dr. Westcott in the twenty years during which he held his professorship at Cambridge: "The Religious Office of the Universities" (1873), "The Paragraph Psalter" (1879), "The New Testament in the Original Greek" (with Dr. Hort), "The Revelation of the Risen Lord" (1881), "The Gospel according to St. John" (in the "Speaker's Commentary" (1882), "The Epistles of St. John" (1883), "The Historic Faith" (1883), "The Revelation of the Father" (1884), "Christus Consummator" (1886), "Social Aspects of Christianity" (1887), "The Epistle to the Hebrews" (1889).

In one[1] of the letters belonging to the Cambridge period occurs, I think, almost the earliest instance quoted of Dr. Westcott's strong dislike to ritualism. "The spirit of ritualism and the spirit of scientific materialism," he writes, "seem to me to be essentially identical. Both tend to hide from us that which is eternal, of which things of sense are the transitory

[1] To Archdeacon Farrar, 1883.

symbols. If only we come back to life—to the life of the New Testament (or of the Bible)—to the Life, we shall have hope" (p. 441).

W. EDWARD CHADWICK.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. VIII.—THE MONTH.

THE mischievous proposal of the Army Guild, on which we commented last month, to hold what would have justly been regarded as an approach, at all events, to a Requiem Mass in St. Paul's Cathedral, has happily been prevented. In consequence of the public protests which were made, including a remonstrance addressed to the Dean of St. Paul's by three Prebendaries of the Cathedral, the proposal was withdrawn by the Army Guild itself; and, with a good feeling which claims recognition, not only was the proposed service abandoned at St. Paul's, but no attempt was made to hold it elsewhere. It is a matter for thankfulness that a proposal which, if persisted in, must have occasioned much strife has thus been successfully resisted; and the widespread public feeling to which this success is due, illustrated by the remarkable support which the *Times* newspaper gave to the resistance, is of good omen for the future. It is but just that a recognition should be expressed of the help rendered by the Ladies' League in the matter. Had not that organization been in readiness to act in such an emergency, a sufficiently influential protest might not have been made in time; and the letter addressed to the press by the President of the League was a good example of the combined firmness and moderation which is to be desired in such a question.

We observe that Canon MacColl, in the *Pilot*, with characteristic incapacity for confining his argument to the real point at issue, has expressed his satisfaction that the profession of allegiance to primitive practice, which is put forward by the leading Churchmen and Churchwomen who opposed the service, has thus been shown to be baseless, since prayers for the dead were undoubtedly a practice of the Early Church. This general question, however, has nothing whatever to do with the present issue. That which was opposed was not the kind of supplications for the holy Dead which are to be found in early Liturgies, but the celebration of the Holy Communion with the avowed intention, on the part of the promoters of the service, to celebrate it as a sacrifice on behalf of the soldiers who had fallen in the war.

It was a celebration of the Holy Communion, in short, of which the object is described and condemned in our Article, "to have remission of pain or guilt." Many of those who joined in this protest would welcome the restoration to our Communion Service, if it were practicable, of such supplications as are found in the ancient Liturgies, while they are resolutely opposed to anything which approximates to the application of the Holy Communion as a sort of sacrifice for the departed. The truth is that the errors and superstitions of the Roman Church have so poisoned the wells and sources of primitive truth and practice that it has become necessary to guard against many a practice which was harmless, and even edifying, in primitive times, because it is still inextricably associated with Roman abuses. Those who desire in any points a closer return to primitive practices should, above all things, take care that their attempts to revive such practices are not marked by a Roman colour. But, on the contrary, the chief advocates of such revivals generally associate them ostentatiously with Roman ceremonial, and with the very language of the Roman Missal. Our reformers, in reasserting primitive truth and practice, went straight back to primitive times. Such associations as the Army Guild seem to think the only way to retrace the path to primitive ground is through Roman territory, and they give us too much reason to believe that they are inclined to stop short at that first stage. Prayers for the dead in the early Church were the natural result of the true Christian spirit, which desires to receive everything—even the most assured of all blessings—through prayer. They were, thus, rather an expression of thankfulness for the blessedness of those who had fallen asleep in Christ, than the means for procuring that blessedness. When prayers for the dead can again be offered in that spirit, and not in a spirit which at least recalls the idea of purgatory, they will be viewed in a very different light by many of those who now oppose their introduction into public worship.

The meetings of the Convocation of Canterbury have been marked by the consideration of three important subjects—the proposed creation of a National Council, representing the two Provinces of Canterbury and York; the relation of the Church of England to the Holy Catholic Church; and the recent discussions respecting the Virgin Birth of our Lord. The debate on the latter subject in the Lower House was held with closed doors, and at the time we are writing its nature and its results are not yet officially known. But the proceedings, both in the Upper and the Lower House, on the question of a National Council were of considerable importance,

if only as illustrating the many and great difficulties which it will present. No one in the Upper House could quite say what a National Council would be, or what would be its relation to the ancient Houses of Convocation. Are these Houses, with all their "undoubted rights and privileges," to be superseded by a newly-created body, the very constitution of which is a matter of keen dispute? Will these two Houses consent to the supersession of their historic authority; and if not, is it proposed to add to the existing six Houses of Convocation and Laymen another House, itself composed of three Houses—Bishops, Priests, and Laymen—by way of simplification? At present the whole scheme would seem to be in the highest degree vague and unpractical; and no due attention seems as yet to have been paid to the constitutional difficulties in the way. There is too much tendency to treat the Church of England in the matter as though it presented the sort of *tabula rasa* of a Colonial Church, and had no ancient and settled constitution. It seems assumed, moreover, that Parliament will agree with the utmost complacency to the new arrangements, and that if the six existing bodies can agree in superseding themselves by some "National Council" which claims to speak in the name of the Church of England, the two Houses of Lords and Commons will gratefully exclaim that here is the voice of the real Church of England to be heard at last, and will at once defer to its utterances. These dreams, however, are to be referred to some joint meeting of the Houses of Convocation and Laymen of the Provinces of York and Canterbury, and to that reference, for the present, we may safely leave them.

ERRATA.

In THE CHURCHMAN of last month—

Page 441, line 20, *for* Aarat *read* Ararat.
" " " 23 " " " "
" 443 " 26 " " " "
" 444 " 17 " Erench " French.
" 394 " 14 " the other Sacraments, *read* the other Sacrament.